

## **APPENDIX B**

Condensed Transcript Report

# Plaintiffs' Affirmative Designations to which Defendants Object Based on Lack of Personal Knowledge

---

Prevoznik, Thomas 04-18-2019  
Prevoznik, Thomas 05-17-2019

---

**Plaintiffs' Affirmatives 00:24:37**

**Total Time 00:24:37**



1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

3 EASTERN DIVISION

4 - - -

5 IN RE: NATIONAL : HON. DAN A.

6 PRESCRIPTION OPIATE : POLSTER LITIGATION :

7 : APPLIES TO ALL CASES : NO.

8 : 1:17-MD-2804 :

9 - HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -

10 SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

11 VOLUME II

12 - - -

13 April 18, 2019

14 - - -

15

16 Continued videotaped deposition of THOMAS PREVOZNIK, taken  
17 pursuant to notice, was held at the law offices of Williams & Connolly,  
17 725 12th

18 Street, Washington, D.C., beginning at 8:16 a.m., on the above date,  
before

19 Michelle L. Gray, a Registered Professional Reporter, Certified  
20 Shorthand Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and Notary Public.

21 - - -

22 GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES

23 877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax deps@golkow.com

24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 411

1 APPEARANCES:  
 2 GREENE, KETCHUM, FARRELL, BAILEY & TWEEL LLP  
 3 PAUL T. FARRELL, JR., ESQ. 419 Eleventh Street  
 4 Huntington, WV 25701 (304) 521-4778  
 5 Paul@greeneketchum.com  
 6 - and -  
 7 MCHUGH & FULLER BY: MICHAEL J. FULLER, ESQ.  
 8 97 Elias Whiddon Road Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39402  
 9 (800) 939-5580 mike@mchughfuller.com  
 10 - and -  
 11 MOTLEY RICE, LLC  
 12 BY: LINDA SINGER, ESQ. 401 9th Street, NW, Suite 1001  
 13 Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 386-9626  
 14 Lsinger@motleyrice.com Representing the Plaintiffs  
 15 - and -  
 16 THE DUGAN LAW FIRM  
 17 BY: BONNIE A. KENDRICK, ESQ. One Canal Place  
 18 365 Canal Place, Suite 1000 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130  
 19 (504) 648-0180 bonnie@dugan-lawfirm.com  
 20 Representing the Plaintiffs  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 413

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY, LLP  
 3 By: ENU MAINIGI, ESQ. BY: COLLEEN McNAMARA, ESQ.  
 4 BY: BRAD MASTERS, ESQ. BY: JENNIFER G. WICHT,  
 5 ESQ.  
 6 725 12th Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20005  
 7 (202) 434-5148 emainigi@wc.com  
 8 cmcnamara@wc.com Bmasters@wc.com  
 9 Jwicht@wc.com Representing the Defendant, Cardinal  
 10 Health  
 11 BARTLT BECK LLP BY: LESTER C. HOUTZ, ESQ.  
 12 1801 Wewatta Street, Suite 1200 Denver, Colorado 80202  
 13 (303) 592-3199 lester.houtz@bartlit-beck.com  
 14 Representing the Defendant, Walgreens  
 15 ROPES & GRAY LLP  
 16 BY: ANDREW O'CONNOR, ESQ. BY: JOSHUA E.  
 17 GOLDSTEIN, ESQ.  
 18 800 Boylston Street Boston, Massachusetts 02199  
 19 (617) 951-7234 Andrew.o'connor@ropesgray.com  
 20 Joshua.goldstein@ropesgray.com Representing the  
 21 Defendant, Mallinckrodt  
 22  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 412

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 414

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2 US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BY: DAVID FINKELSTEIN,  
 3 ESQ.  
 4 BY: NATALIE A. WAITES, ESQ. 175 N Street, NE, Room 10-  
 2222  
 5 Washington, DC 20002 (202) 616-2964  
 6 david.m.finkelstein@usdoj.gov natalie.a.waites@usdoj.gov  
 7 - and -  
 8 US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
 9 BY: JAMES R. BENNETT, II, ESQ. United States Courthouse  
 10 801 West Superior Avenue Suite 400  
 11 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 (216) 622-3988  
 12 James.bennett4@usdoj.gov  
 13 - and -  
 14 US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BY: MARIAMA C. SPEARS,  
 15 ESQ.  
 16 8701 Morrisette Drive Springfield, Virginia 22152  
 17 (202) 598-6204 Mariama.c.spears@usdoj.gov  
 18 Representing the US DOJ  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2  
 3 DECHERT, LLP BY: JENNA C. NEWMARK, ESQ  
 4 1095 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036  
 5 (212) 698-3500 Jenna.newmark@dechert.com  
 6 Representing the Defendant, Purdue Pharmaceuticals  
 7  
 8 MARCUS & SHAPIRA, LLP BY: JOSHUA A. KOBIN, ESQ.  
 9 One Oxford Centre, 35th Floor Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
 10 15219 (412) 338-3990 Kobrin@marcus-shapira.com  
 11 Representing the Defendant, HBC Service Company  
 12  
 13 ZUCKERMAN SPAEDER, LLP BY: R. MILES CLARK, ESQ.  
 14 1800 M. Street NW, Suite 1000 Washington, D.C. 20036  
 15 (202) 778-1845 Mclark@zuckerman.com  
 16 Representing the Defendant, CVS  
 17 REED SMITH, LLP  
 18 BY: ROBERT A. NICHOLAS, ESQ. BY: JOSEPH J.  
 19 MAHADY, ESQ.  
 20 Three Logan Square 1717 Arch Street, Suite 3100  
 21 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 (215) 851-8226  
 22 r nicholas@reedsmith.com Jmahady@reedsmith.com  
 23 Representing the Defendant, AmerisourceBergen Drug  
 24 Corporation

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 415

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2  
 3 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP BY: JOHN P. LAVELLE,  
 JR., ESQ.  
 4 1701 Market Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103  
 5 (215) 963-4824 John.lavelle@morganlewis.com  
 6 Representing the Defendant, Rite Aid Corporation  
 7  
 8 FOLEY & LARDNER, LLP BY: KRISTINA J. MATIC, ESQ.  
 9 777 East Wisconsin Avenue Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202  
 10 (414) 297-5913 kmatic@foley.com  
 11 Representing Actavis Laboratories UT, Inc., Actavis Pharma,  
 Inc.,  
 12 ANDA, Inc., and Actavis, Inc., (N/k/a Allergan Finance, LLC,  
 Watson  
 13 Laboratories, Inc.  
 14 KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP  
 15 BY: JENNIFER G. LEVY, ESQ. 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue,  
 N.W.  
 16 Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 879-5211  
 17 Jennifer.levy@kirkland.com  
 18 - and -  
 19 KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP BY: KAITLYN COVERSTONE,  
 ESQ.  
 20 300 North LaSalle Street Chicago, Illinois 60654  
 21 (312) 862-7184 Kaitlyn.coverstone@kirkland.com  
 22 Representing the Defendant, Allergan  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 417

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2 BARNES & THORNBURG, LLP  
 3 BY: WILLIAM E. PADGETT, ESQ. 11 South Meridian Street  
 4 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 (317) 236-1313  
 william.padgett@btlaw.com Representing the Defendant, H.D.  
 5 Smith  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 416

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2  
 3 COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP BY: CHRISTOPHER K.  
 EPPICH, ESQ.  
 4 1999 Avenue of the Stars Los Angeles, California 90067  
 5 (424) 332-4764 Ceppich@cov.com  
 6 - and -  
 7 COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP  
 8 BY: KEVIN KELLY, ESQ. 850 Tenth Street, NW  
 9 Suite 586N Washington, D.C. 20001  
 10 (202) 662-5613 Kkelly@cov.com  
 11 - and -  
 12 COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP  
 13 BY: MEGHAN E. MONAGHAN, ESQ. 850 Tenth Street, NW  
 14 Suite 586N Washington, D.C. 20001  
 15 mmonaghan@cov.com (202) 662-5110  
 16 Representing the Defendant, McKesson Corporation  
 17  
 18 JONES DAY BY: NEAL J. STEPHENS, ESQ.  
 19 1755 Embarcadero Road Palo Alto, California 94303  
 20 (650) 739-3939 Nstephens@jonesday.com  
 21 Representing the Defendant, Walmart  
 22  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 418

1 TELEPHONIC/STREAMING APPEARANCES:  
 2 LEVIN PAPANTONIO, P.A.  
 3 BY: PETER MOUGHEY, ESQ. 316 Baylen Street  
 4 Pensacola, Florida 32502 (850) 435-7000  
 5 pmougey@levinlaw.com  
 6 - and -  
 7 BARON & BUDD, P.C. BY: STERLING CLUFF, ESQ.  
 8 Encino Plaza 15910 Ventura Boulevard,  
 9 Suite 1600 Encino, California 91436  
 10 (818) 839-2333 Scluff@baronbudd.com  
 11 - and -  
 12 BARON & BUDD, P.C.  
 13 BY: WILLIAM G. POWERS, ESQ. 600 New Hampshire  
 Avenue, NW  
 14 The Watergate, Suite 10-A Washington, D.C. 20037  
 15 (202) 333-4562 Wpowers@baronbudd.com  
 16 - and -  
 17 BARON & BUDD, P.C.  
 18 BY: THOMAS SIMS, ESQ. The Centrum  
 19 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 1100 Dallas, Texas 75219  
 20 (214) 521-3605 Tsims@baronbudd.com  
 21 Representing the Plaintiffs  
 22  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 419

1 TELEPHONIC/STREAMING APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2  
 3 MOTLEY RICE, LLC BY: AMANDA UNTERREINER, ESQ.  
 4 401 9th Street, NW, Suite 1001  
 5 Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 386-9626  
 6 aunterreiner@motleyrice.com Representing the Plaintiffs  
 7  
 8 ARNOLD PORTER KAYE SCHOLER, LLP BY: JOSHUA M.  
 9 DAVIS, ESQ.  
 10 601 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001  
 11 (202) 942-5000 joshua.davis@arnoldporter.com  
 Representing the Defendants, Endo Health Solutions Endo  
 Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Par  
 12 Pharmaceutical Companies, Inc. f/k/a Par Pharmaceutical  
 Holdings, Inc.  
 13  
 14 REED SMITH, LLP BY: SHANNON E. McCLURE, ESQ.  
 15 Three Logan Square 1717 Arch Street, Suite 3100  
 16 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 (215) 851-8226  
 17 smcclure@reedsmith.com Representing the Defendant,  
 18 AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation  
 19 CAVITCH FAMILO & DURKIN, CO., L.P.A.  
 20 BY: ERIC J. WEISS, ESQ. 1300 E. 9th Street  
 21 Cleveland, Ohio 44114 (216) 621-7860  
 22 Eweiss@cavitch.com Representing the Defendant, Discount  
 Drug  
 23 Mart

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 421

1 TELEPHONIC/STREAMING APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2  
 3 VENABLE, LLP BY: JAMES K. O'CONNOR, ESQ.  
 4 750 E. Pratt Street, Suite 900 Baltimore, Maryland 21202  
 5 (410) 244-7742 Jko'connor@venable.com  
 Representing the Defendant, Abbott Laboratories and Abbott  
 Laboratories,  
 6 Inc.  
 7 LOCKE LORD, LLP  
 8 BY: MADELEINE E. BRUNNER, ESQ. 2200 Ross Avenue  
 10 Suite 2800 Dallas, Texas 75201  
 11 (214) 740.8758 Maddie.brunner@lockelord.com  
 12 Representing the Defendant, Henry Schein, Inc.  
 13  
 14 O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP BY: EMILIE K. WINCKEL, ESQ.  
 15 1625 Eye Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20006  
 16 (202) 383-5300 Ewinckel@omm.com  
 Representing the Defendants, Janssen and Johnson &  
 17 Johnson  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 420

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 422

1 TELEPHONIC/STREAMING APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2  
 3 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP BY: LATIERA  
 RAYFORD, ESQ.  
 4 BY: ZACHARY R. LAZAR, ESQ. 77 West Wacker Drive  
 5 Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 324-1481  
 6 L a t i e r a . r a y f o r d @ m o r g a n l e w i s . c o m  
 Zachary.lazar@morganlewis.com  
 7 Teva Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Cephalon Inc., Watson  
 Laboratories, Actavis LLC, Actavis  
 8 Pharma, Inc.  
 9 BAILEY & WYANT P.L.L.C.  
 10 BY: HARRISON M. CYRUS, ESQ. 500 Virginia Street East  
 11 Suite 600 Charleston, West Virginia 25301  
 12 (304) 345-4222 Hcyrus@baileywyant.com  
 13 Representing the Defendant, West Virginia Board of  
 Pharmacy  
 14  
 15 FOX ROTHSCHILD, LLP BY: ZACHARY MARTIN, ESQ.  
 16 2700 Kelly Road Suite 300  
 17 Warrington, Pennsylvania 18976 (215) 918-3680  
 18 Zmartin@foxrothschild.com Representing the Defendant,  
 Prescription  
 19 Supply Inc.  
 20 JONES DAY  
 21 BY: PATRICK J. BEISELL, ESQ. 77 West Wacker  
 22 Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 269-4066  
 23 Pbeisell@jonesday.com Representing the Defendant,  
 Walmart

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)  
 2  
 3 ALSO PRESENT:  
 4 Kaitlyn Eekhoff - Paralegal  
 5 (Via telephone) (Motley Rice)  
 6 Jenna Forster - Paralegal  
 7 (Motley Rice)  
 8  
 9 VIDEOTAPE TECHNICIAN: Chris Ritona  
 10  
 11 LITIGATION TECHNICIAN: John Knowles  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 423

1 - - -  
2 I N D E X  
3 - - -  
4 Testimony of:  
5 THOMAS PREVOZNIK  
6  
7 By Mr. Stephens 430  
8 By Mr. Farrell 597  
9  
10  
11  
12 - - -  
13 E X H I B I T S  
14 - - -  
15  
16 NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE  
17 DEA Prevoznik-15 Hearing Before 437  
18 The Subcommittee On Oversight and  
19 Investigations 5/8/18  
20 Challenges and Solutions in the  
21 Opioid Crisis  
22  
23  
24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 425

1 - - -  
2 E X H I B I T S (Cont'd.)  
3 - - -  
4  
5 NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE  
6 DEA Prevoznik-21 (Clawed Back) 585  
7 US-DEA-00011196-98  
8 DEA Prevoznik  
9 P-1 21 USCA 801 685  
10 DEA Prevoznik  
11 P-2 House Report No. 686 91-1444  
12 9/10/70  
13 DEA Prevoznik  
14 P-3 HathiTrust 686 Drug Abuse Control  
15 Amendments 1970  
16 DEA Prevoznik  
17 P-4 Proposed Rule 687 Making, Part 301  
18 Federal Register Vol. 36  
19 3/13/71  
20 DEA Prevoznik  
21 P-5 Rules & Regulations 688 Title 21 Food and  
22 Drugs Federal Register  
23 Vol. 36 4/24/71  
24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 424

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 426

1 - - -  
2 E X H I B I T S (Cont'd.)  
3 - - -  
4  
5 NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE  
6 DEA Prevoznik-16 DEA Letter, 450  
7 9/27/06 In Re: In Reference  
8 To Registration US-DEA-00022459  
9 DEA  
10 Prevoznik-17 Hearing Before 466 The Subcommittee  
11 On Oversight and Investigations  
12 3/20/18 The Drug Enforcement  
13 Administration's Role In Combating the Opioid  
14 Epidemic  
15 DEA Prevoznik-18 Hearing Before 473  
16 The Committee on the Judiciary US Senate  
17 5/16/17 Rogue Online Pharmacies  
18 DEA  
19 Prevoznik-19 DEA Announces Tool 536 For Registered  
20 Drug  
20 Manufacturers  
21 DEA Prevoznik-20 Hearing Before the 571  
22 Permanent Subcommittee On Investigations  
23 Combating the Opioid Crisis  
24

1 - - -  
2 E X H I B I T S (Cont'd.)  
3 - - -  
4  
5 NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE  
6 DEA Prevoznik  
7 P-6 21 CFR 1301.74 688  
8 DEA  
9 Prevoznik P-7 NWDA Suspicious 689  
10 Order Monitoring System  
11 CAH-MDL2804-01465723-34  
12 DEA Prevoznik  
13 P-8 Plaintiff Cardinal 691 Health Reply in Support  
14 Of Motion for Preliminary Injunction  
15 DEA  
16 Prevoznik P-9 CSMP Page 16 691  
17 MCKMDL00409239  
18 DEA Prevoznik  
19 P-10 DEA Letter 703 Request No. 03-1134-F  
20 Subject, Diversion Investigators Manual  
21 CAH-MDL2804-02203353-57  
22  
23  
24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 427

1 - - -  
2 EXHIBITS (Cont'd.)  
3 - - -  
4  
5 NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE  
6 DEA Prevoznik  
7 P-11 Report to the 709 US Attorney General  
8 By the Suspicious Orders Task Force  
9 October 1998 CAH\_HOUSE\_002207-98  
10 DEA  
11 Prevoznik P-12 Reservation of Rights 730  
12 Cardinal Health's Third Supplemental Objections  
13 DEA  
14 Prevoznik P-13 Chemical Handler's 754  
15 Manual A Guide to Chemical Control Regulations  
16 1/2004 CAH 032635-703  
17 DEA  
18 Prevoznik P-14 DEA Letter, 9/27/06 760  
19 In Re, In Reference To Registration  
20  
21 DEA Prevoznik  
22 P-15 DEA Letter, 12/27/07 764 In Re, In Reference  
23 To Registration ABDCMDL00269685-86  
24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 429

1 - - -  
2 DEPOSITION SUPPORT INDEX  
3 - - -  
4  
5 Direction to Witness Not to Answer  
6 PAGE LINE 485 4  
7 489 8 489 16  
8 608 1  
9 Request for Production of Documents  
10 PAGE LINE  
11 None.  
12 Stipulations  
13 PAGE LINE  
14 None.  
15 Questions Marked  
16 PAGE LINE  
17 None.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 428

1 - - -  
2 EXHIBITS (Cont'd.)  
3 - - -  
4  
5 NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE  
6 DEA Prevoznik  
7 P-16 Federal Register 772 Vol. 73 9/10/08  
8 08-33  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 430

1 - - -  
2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good  
3 morning. Today is April 18, 2019,  
4 8:15 a.m., and this is the  
5 continuation of the deposition of  
6 Thomas Prevoznik.  
7 - - -  
8 ... THOMAS PREVOZNIK, having  
9 been previously sworn, was  
10 examined and testified as follows:  
11 - - -  
12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I  
13 apologize. We need to go off the  
14 record. 8:16. We are off the  
15 video record.  
16 (Brief pause.)  
17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 8:18, we  
18 are on the video record.  
19 - - -  
20 EXAMINATION  
21 (Continued)  
22 - - -  
23 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
24 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, good morning.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 431

1 A. Good morning.  
 2 Q. Let me introduce myself.  
 3 I'm Neal Stephens.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Guys.  
 5 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 6 Q. I represent Jones Day, and  
 7 I'm asking you questions on behalf of the  
 8 retail pharmacies. You remember that  
 9 from yesterday, right?  
 10 A. Yes, I do.  
 11 Q. Okay. So let me -- let me  
 12 go back to where we were yesterday. And  
 13 we were talking through --  
 14 A. Could I just clarify  
 15 something from yesterday, please?  
 16 Q. Sure.  
 17 A. Okay. First of all I want  
 18 to thank everybody for allowing me to try  
 19 to catch my train. Of course with DC  
 20 around here, my train was delayed. And  
 21 while I was delayed, I went to our  
 22 website because I was reflecting on my  
 23 testimony earlier.  
 24 And one of the things that

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 433

1 Q. Correct.  
 2 A. Both were Inner Harbor in  
 3 Maryland.  
 4 Q. Okay. And the 2015 was in  
 5 Maryland as well?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. All right. Thank you for  
 8 that.  
 9 And if I could,  
 10 Mr. Prevoznik, I'd like to go back to  
 11 where I ended last evening and pick back  
 12 up there again today. I just have a few  
 13 predicate questions to ask you before we  
 14 go back into it. Okay.  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. All right. We were talking  
 17 through Topic 2 and Topic 3 of your  
 18 30(b)(6) designation. And would you  
 19 agree that who is diverting in the  
 20 marketplace is relevant to how someone is  
 21 designing their SOMs program?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 23 Vague.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Could you

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 432

1 came up was guidance as well as  
 2 conferences. And I know I didn't mention  
 3 the conferences and the dates. So I just  
 4 went to our website. And on our website  
 5 we do have meetings and it has past  
 6 meetings. So I just looked on there. I  
 7 want to be able to say that in 2007 and  
 8 2009, '7 was in Houston, 2009 was in  
 9 Oregon, Portland.  
 10 Those were pharmaceutical  
 11 industry conferences. That was  
 12 wholesalers, distributors, some  
 13 importers. So those conferences were  
 14 there.  
 15 And then somehow I  
 16 completely forgot about the  
 17 manufacturers, importers, and exporter  
 18 conferences that were in '13 and '15, in  
 19 particular the '15 one because I actually  
 20 gave a presentation. So I apologize for  
 21 that. But I just wanted to clarify that.  
 22 Q. Where was the location of  
 23 the 2013 conference?  
 24 A. The manufacturers?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 434

1 expand on --  
 2 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 3 Q. DEA looks to where diversion  
 4 is occurring in the United States, right?  
 5 A. Correct.  
 6 Q. Where it's happening in the  
 7 marketplace?  
 8 A. Correct.  
 9 Q. Okay. My point is when  
 10 you're designing a SOMs system, it's  
 11 relevant where diversion is occurring as  
 12 to how you develop your SOMs system,  
 13 right?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 15 Vague.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Well, within  
 17 the closed system of distribution,  
 18 the whole -- the whole point of  
 19 the system is to have effective  
 20 means to guard against diversion.  
 21 So each -- it's all  
 22 interconnected.  
 23 So I don't want to say one  
 24 is more important than the other

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 435

1 one because each step affects the  
 2 next step --  
 3 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 4 Q. Okay, but.  
 5 A. -- in either direction.  
 6 Q. Okay. Sorry. I didn't mean  
 7 to interrupt you there.  
 8 Would you agree that to --  
 9 and these are just predicate questions.  
 10 To assess if an order is suspicious, it's  
 11 relevant where the shipping is going?  
 12 A. That's -- yeah.  
 13 Q. Okay.  
 14 A. That's one of -- yes.  
 15 That's one of the --  
 16 Q. Not the only criteria --  
 17 A. Right. That's one of them.  
 18 Q. -- it's one of them.  
 19 Okay. So if it's relevant  
 20 where it's going, where diversion is  
 21 occurring in the marketplace is relevant,  
 22 right? One characteristic of relevance?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. Yes, okay. That's the only

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 437

1 are all trying to do right by their  
 2 patients. Are you familiar with that?  
 3 A. Could I see the testimony?  
 4 Q. Sure.  
 5 (Document marked for  
 6 identification as Exhibit  
 7 DEA-Prevoznik-15.)  
 8 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 9 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, I marked as  
 10 Exhibit Number 15 a hearing dated May 8,  
 11 2018, entitled "Challenges and Solutions  
 12 in the Opioid Crisis" before the  
 13 Committee of the Judiciary, House of  
 14 Representatives. I would direct you to  
 15 Page 32.  
 16 If you look at the top of  
 17 32, there's a paragraph that indicates  
 18 that Mr. Patterson is talking.  
 19 A. Correct.  
 20 Q. Do you see that?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Now, Robert Patterson in  
 23 2018 was the director -- I'm sorry, the  
 24 administrator of DEA?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 436

1 point I'm trying to make.  
 2 A. Okay.  
 3 Q. All right. So I would then  
 4 like to continue asking you questions  
 5 about DEA's interpretation and  
 6 enforcement of the Controlled Substances  
 7 Act and the relevant regulations and how  
 8 that relates to the design of a  
 9 reasonable SOMs system. Okay?  
 10 A. Okay.  
 11 Q. All right. Now, yesterday  
 12 when we stopped, I believe we had just  
 13 referred to Exhibit 14, which was  
 14 statements that Mr. Rannazzisi had made  
 15 to Congress about 99.5 percent of the  
 16 prescribers not overprescribing. Do you  
 17 recall that testimony?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. Okay. That testimony  
 20 occurred in 2014, right?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Okay. Now, more recently,  
 23 in 2018, Mr. Patterson testified in front  
 24 of Congress that 99.9 percent of doctors

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 438

1 A. Acting administrator.  
 2 Q. Acting administrator.  
 3 A. Right.  
 4 Q. It's the number one position  
 5 at DEA?  
 6 A. Correct.  
 7 Q. Okay. So here Mr. Patterson  
 8 was asked a question, and in part of his  
 9 response he says, "But I go back to the  
 10 fact that I look at the vast majority of  
 11 doctors, 99.99 percent are all trying to  
 12 do right by their patients."  
 13 Do you see that?  
 14 A. Correct.  
 15 Q. Did I read that accurately?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. Okay. DEA agrees, as of  
 18 2018, that 99.9 percent of doctors are  
 19 all trying to do right by their patients,  
 20 right?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 22 THE WITNESS: I don't -- I  
 23 mean, he's stated that, but I  
 24 don't think it's a static number.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 439

1 So I mean, I think -- it will  
 2 fluctuate depending on what a  
 3 prescriber eventually does.  
 4 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 5 Q. Okay. As of --  
 6 A. As of that date, that's what  
 7 was said, yes.  
 8 Q. Okay. He was the number one  
 9 person at DEA when he made that  
 10 statement, right?  
 11 A. Right.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 13 answered.  
 14 MR. FARRELL: Excuse me.  
 15 Could you please repeat the  
 16 exhibit number?  
 17 MR. STEPHENS: Sure. That's  
 18 number 15, Paul.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And wait  
 20 for my objections.  
 21 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 22 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, if  
 23 99.99 percent of prescribers acted  
 24 appropriately, the diversion problems DEA

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 441

1 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 2 Q. All right. You would agree  
 3 that not all registrants distributed  
 4 controlled substances to the one-tenth  
 5 of 1 percent of the prescribers who  
 6 diverted opioids from 1998 to present?  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 8 Scope. Foundation.  
 9 Mischaracterizes prior testimony.  
 10 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.  
 11 Could you repeat?  
 12 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 13 Q. Sure. So we're talking  
 14 about the one-tenth of 1 percent, right,  
 15 of prescribers?  
 16 A. Right.  
 17 Q. Okay. You would agree that  
 18 not all registrants distributed  
 19 controlled substances to the one-tenth of  
 20 1 percent of prescribers who diverted  
 21 opioids?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 23 objections.  
 24 THE WITNESS: What was the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 440

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 442

1 confronts are generated by the remaining  
 2 one-tenth of 1 percent of the  
 3 prescribers?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 5 Foundation. Mischaracterizes  
 6 prior testimony.  
 7 THE WITNESS: If you go with  
 8 that number, yes, that's correct.  
 9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 10 Q. Okay. DEA currently has  
 11 more than 1.7 million registrants?  
 12 A. Correct.  
 13 Q. Okay. And as you recall  
 14 yesterday, we talked about prescribing  
 15 doctors being registrants, right?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. Okay. You would agree --  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm sorry.  
 19 Can I just interrupt for one  
 20 second. Your -- the softness of  
 21 your answer is creating problems  
 22 for the transcript. I just  
 23 noticed. Please speak louder.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry.

1 time frame?  
 2 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 3 Q. 1998 to present.  
 4 A. This statement was in 2018.  
 5 So the percentage -- the percentage would  
 6 have been different of that.  
 7 Q. Do you have --  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Tom, a  
 9 little louder.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Okay. You're  
 11 asking me from 1998 forward, and  
 12 this statement was made May 8,  
 13 2018.  
 14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 15 Q. All right.  
 16 A. So the percentage -- that  
 17 number would not be 99.99 percent.  
 18 Again, it's not a static number that goes  
 19 year to year.  
 20 Q. In 2014, Mr. Rannazzisi  
 21 estimated 99.5 percent, right?  
 22 A. Correct.  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 24 Foundation. Mischaracterizes

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 443

1 prior testimony. Scope.  
2 You can answer.  
3 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
4 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
5 Q. That's one-half of one  
6 percent, right?  
7 A. Correct.  
8 Q. 2018, Mr. Patterson said  
9 99.99 percent.  
10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
11 answered.  
12 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
13 Q. That's one-tenth of 1  
14 percent, right?  
15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
16 answered.  
17 You can answer again.  
18 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
20 Q. Okay. Do you have a number  
21 from 2005?  
22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
23 Scope. You can answer if you  
24 know.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 445

1 THE WITNESS: With the  
2 pharmacy diversion awareness  
3 conferences, I was with  
4 Mr. Rannazzisi at those  
5 conferences. And when we did the  
6 presentation, so that was from --  
7 when I joined -- when I went to  
8 headquarters in April 2012,  
9 Atlanta was the first PDAC that I  
10 went to. So from that point on,  
11 pretty much every time that we had  
12 a presentation, we would say 1 to  
13 2 percent. So that is the figure  
14 that I know of, 1 to 2 percent.  
15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
16 Q. Okay. Would you agree then  
17 that not all registrants distributed  
18 controlled substance to the 1 or  
19 2 percent of prescribers who diverted  
20 opioids from 2005 to 2018?  
21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
22 Scope.  
23 THE WITNESS: I believe I'd  
24 be speculating, but -- I would be

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 444

1 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
2 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
3 Q. Okay. Do you have a number  
4 from 1998?  
5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
6 Scope. You can answer if you  
7 know.  
8 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
10 Q. Okay. Do you have any basis  
11 to say that it's less than 99 percent of  
12 prescribers?  
13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
14 Scope.  
15 Counsel, do you have any  
16 questions within the scope of this  
17 notice?  
18 MR. STEPHENS: I've already  
19 established that they are within  
20 the scope.  
21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: We  
22 disagree. We'll let this continue  
23 a little bit longer.  
24 You can answer if you know.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 446

1 speculating on that, but, yes.  
2 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
3 Q. Okay. I'd like to continue  
4 by asking you some additional questions  
5 about interpretation enforcement of  
6 Title 21 U.S.C. 23, the regulations and  
7 how those relate to the design of a  
8 reasonable SOMs system. Okay?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. Okay. So yesterday you --  
11 you testified about different  
12 distributors having different business  
13 models, right?  
14 A. Correct.  
15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
16 Scope. Characterization.  
17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
18 Q. Is it fair to say that a  
19 SOMs systems is not a one-size-all  
20 proposition, one-size-fits-all  
21 proposition?  
22 A. Correct.  
23 Q. And DEA understands that not  
24 all registrants distribute opioids to the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 447

1 same customers, right?  
 2 A. Correct.  
 3 Q. DEA understands that  
 4 registrants have different business  
 5 models?  
 6 A. Correct.  
 7 Q. And DEA expects that each  
 8 registrant will review its own business  
 9 model and design a SOM system that fits  
 10 its specific method of distribution?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 12 Vague.  
 13 THE WITNESS: That's correct  
 14 as -- as per the regulations.  
 15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 16 Q. Okay. Some registrants  
 17 distribute to hospitals?  
 18 A. Correct.  
 19 Q. Some don't?  
 20 A. Correct.  
 21 Q. Some registrants distribute  
 22 to hospice centers?  
 23 A. Correct.  
 24 Q. Some don't?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 449

1 Retail chain pharmacies  
 2 commonly use a self-distributing model  
 3 where they distribute to chain pharmacy  
 4 locations that they own.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 6 Scope. Answer if you know.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Some do, and  
 8 some have changed.  
 9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 10 Q. Okay. For example,  
 11 Walmart's distribution centers only  
 12 distributed to Walmart pharmacies at  
 13 Walmart store locations?  
 14 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 16 Scope. Calls for speculation.  
 17 THE WITNESS: That was  
 18 correct, yes.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. All right. I'd like to ask  
 21 you some questions about Topic 3 related  
 22 to the guidance that DEA provides  
 23 regarding the adequacy of SOM systems.  
 24 Okay?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 448

1 A. Correct.  
 2 Q. Some registrants distribute  
 3 to independent pharmacies that the  
 4 registrants do not own?  
 5 A. Correct.  
 6 Q. Some registrants, like  
 7 retail chain pharmacies, do not  
 8 distribute to independent pharmacies that  
 9 they do not own?  
 10 A. I don't know if I completely  
 11 agree with that. Because you can have --  
 12 you could have a -- a  
 13 registrant-to-registrant sale of -- a  
 14 distribution from a chain store to an  
 15 independent store. You can do it. So I  
 16 can't say carte blanche that that  
 17 doesn't -- hasn't occurred or -- I just  
 18 can't say that --  
 19 Q. Okay.  
 20 A. -- because that's not an  
 21 ARCOS reportable transaction.  
 22 Q. So let -- let me follow up  
 23 with a different question. Come at it  
 24 this way.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 450

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. All right. DEA expected  
 3 that each registrant would take  
 4 reasonable steps to avoid shipping  
 5 prescription opioids to individuals who  
 6 would divert the controlled substances?  
 7 A. Is that a question?  
 8 Q. Yes.  
 9 A. I thought it was a  
 10 statement. Yes.  
 11 Q. All right. Let me show you  
 12 Exhibit 16 which will be the dear  
 13 registrant letter dated September 27,  
 14 2006.  
 15 (Document marked for  
 16 identification as Exhibit  
 17 DEA-Prevoznik-16.)  
 18 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 19 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, you're  
 20 familiar with Exhibit Number 16, correct?  
 21 A. Correct.  
 22 Q. All right. I direct your  
 23 attention, do you see on the first page  
 24 where it says background?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 451

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. I would direct you to the  
 3 second paragraph. And the first sentence  
 4 says, "The CSA was designed by Congress  
 5 to combat diversion by providing for a  
 6 closed system of drug distribution in  
 7 which all legitimate handlers of  
 8 controlled substances must obtain a DEA  
 9 registration, and, as a condition of  
 10 maintaining such registration, must take  
 11 reasonable steps to ensure that the  
 12 registration is not being utilized as a  
 13 source of diversion."  
 14 Do you see that?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Do you agree with that  
 17 statement?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. Okay. So the -- the  
 20 direction -- the statement here is that  
 21 distributors need to take reasonable  
 22 steps, right?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. The -- the letter does not

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 453

1 Subject to that objection,  
 2 you can answer.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 4 please repeat it?  
 5 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 6 Q. Sure. DEA would agree that  
 7 a distributor was acting reasonably if it  
 8 structured its business so it only  
 9 distributed to retail chain pharmacies  
 10 who were among the 99 -- 98 to  
 11 99.9 percent of registrants who did not  
 12 divert controlled substances?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Also  
 14 foundation.  
 15 You can answer.  
 16 MR. FARRELL: Excuse me. I  
 17 need -- I think I need to place an  
 18 objection on the record.  
 19 Objection. I think I need  
 20 to say something on the record.  
 21 Noting that you represent  
 22 Walmart, I just want to make sure  
 23 that we -- the questions that  
 24 you're asking are tailored in

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 452

1 state that registrants need to take every  
 2 possible step, does it?  
 3 A. No. It says reasonable.  
 4 Q. Okay. Now, one key point of  
 5 the Controlled Substances Act is that DEA  
 6 wanted registrants to set up their supply  
 7 chain so they did not supply controlled  
 8 substances to customers who diverted  
 9 them, right?  
 10 A. Correct.  
 11 Q. Okay. Would DEA agree that  
 12 a distributor was acting reasonably if it  
 13 structured its business so that it only  
 14 distributed to retail chain pharmacies  
 15 who were among the 98 to 99.9 percent of  
 16 registrants who did not divert controlled  
 17 substances?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 19 Incomplete hypothetical, and I  
 20 will instruct you not to answer to  
 21 the extent that that answer  
 22 requires information relating to  
 23 ongoing enforcement actions or  
 24 investigations.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 454

1 terms of Walmart's capacity as a  
 2 distributor, instead of Walmart's  
 3 capacity as a dispenser, because  
 4 as you know, we've long had  
 5 litigation quarrels on whether or  
 6 not we can get into dispensing  
 7 practices.  
 8 So I just want to make sure  
 9 the record is clear that the  
 10 plaintiffs and the PEC are not  
 11 waiving their right to one day  
 12 open discussions on dispensing  
 13 practices.  
 14 MR. STEPHENS: Paul, if --  
 15 if you look at my question, my  
 16 question only talks about  
 17 distribution.  
 18 MR. FARRELL: Then you  
 19 talked about the 99 percent of  
 20 prescribers. So that's why I was  
 21 concerned whether or not --  
 22 MR. STEPHENS: It's -- it's  
 23 simply distribution. That's all  
 24 I'm asking. That's why the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 455

1 question has got two references to  
 2 distribution, period.  
 3 MR. FARRELL: Okay. Very  
 4 good. Sorry.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Do you  
 6 remember the question?  
 7 THE WITNESS: One more time  
 8 please.  
 9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 10 Q. DEA would agree that a  
 11 distributor was acting reasonably if it  
 12 structured its business so it only  
 13 distributed to retail chain pharmacies  
 14 who were among the 99.5 percent,  
 15 98 percent of registrants who did not  
 16 divert controlled substances?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: The  
 18 objections are foundation,  
 19 incomplete hypothetical, and don't  
 20 answer based on confidential law  
 21 enforcement information.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Okay. Again,  
 23 I think this goes back to, you can  
 24 have the best plans, but in terms

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 457

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 2 hypothetical.  
 3 MR. FARRELL: Again, my  
 4 objection is you laid the  
 5 foundation that the 1 or 2 percent  
 6 included doctors trying to do the  
 7 right thing. So I just want to  
 8 make it clear that if we're  
 9 getting into dispensing claims,  
 10 that's a big issue for the  
 11 plaintiffs.  
 12 MR. STEPHENS: I'm not.  
 13 THE WITNESS: I would just  
 14 repeat that you can have the best  
 15 strategy planned, but are you  
 16 executing that plan.  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. Okay. All right. But if a  
 19 distributor, just generally, a  
 20 distributor -- if a distributor is not  
 21 distributing prescription opioids to  
 22 someone who is diverting them, is the  
 23 distributor acting reasonably in the eyes  
 24 of DEA?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 456

1 of execution and implementation of  
 2 that plan, that business plan  
 3 you're talking about, we did have  
 4 a chain that it was specifically  
 5 on their distribution center that  
 6 did not report suspicious orders  
 7 and that was part of a civil  
 8 settlement of \$80 million.  
 9 So that company thought they  
 10 had a business strategy in place  
 11 and they ended up with their  
 12 distribution center in Florida not  
 13 doing what they said they were  
 14 going to do.  
 15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 16 Q. Okay. Let me re-ask it from  
 17 a different angle.  
 18 A. Sure.  
 19 Q. Does DEA agree the  
 20 distributor is acting reasonably if it  
 21 structured its business model so it  
 22 distributes to customers who are not  
 23 among the 1 or 2 percent of people who  
 24 divert prescription opioids?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 458

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 2 hypothetical. That was the third  
 3 time you asked.  
 4 You can answer a third time.  
 5 THE WITNESS: The --  
 6 their -- according to your --  
 7 my -- what I understand you're  
 8 asking is, it's a distributor, a  
 9 company distributor is sending to  
 10 their own pharmacies, correct?  
 11 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 12 Q. No. I've changed that.  
 13 A. Okay.  
 14 Q. Okay. So my question is, if  
 15 a distributor is not distributing  
 16 prescription opioids to someone who is  
 17 diverting them, is the distributor acting  
 18 reasonably in the eyes of DEA?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 20 hypothetical. Asked and answered.  
 21 THE WITNESS: This -- this  
 22 isn't just, I mean, just opioids,  
 23 you have responsibility for all  
 24 controlled substances that are

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 459

1 distributed. It's not just  
 2 opioids. The responsibility is  
 3 all controlled substances.  
 4 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 5 Q. Okay. So let me re-ask the  
 6 question. If a distributor is not  
 7 distributing controlled substances to  
 8 someone who is diverting them, is the  
 9 distributor acting reasonably in the eyes  
 10 of DEA?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 12 hypothetical. Asked and answered.  
 13 Go ahead and answer again.  
 14 THE WITNESS: So there's no  
 15 controlled substances being  
 16 distributed?  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. Let me re-ask the question.  
 19 A. Sure.  
 20 Q. If a distributor is not  
 21 distributing controlled substances to  
 22 someone who is diverting them, is the  
 23 distributor acting reasonably in the eyes  
 24 of DEA?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 461

1 registrants about a registrant's SOMs  
 2 system, true?  
 3 A. Yes. True.  
 4 Q. DEA headquarters expects a  
 5 registrant to listen to the information  
 6 it receives from DEA field office  
 7 personnel, true?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yeah. It  
 10 depends what they are asking,  
 11 sure.  
 12 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 13 Q. Okay. And the registrants  
 14 who are visited by DEA field office  
 15 personnel can rely on the information  
 16 that they receive from DEA field division  
 17 personnel regarding SOMs systems, true?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 19 Incomplete hypothetical.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yeah, they get  
 21 guidance.  
 22 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 23 Q. Would you agree that it's  
 24 important for DEA's diversion control

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 460

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 462

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 2 hypothetical. Asked and answered.  
 3 THE WITNESS: To -- give me  
 4 the last part? Who is it going  
 5 to?  
 6 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 7 Q. If a distributor is not  
 8 distributing controlled substances to  
 9 someone who is diverting them and  
 10 distributing to others, is the  
 11 distributor acting reasonably in the eyes  
 12 of DEA?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 14 objections.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 17 Q. Okay. The diversion control  
 18 group at DEA headquarters in Washington  
 19 DC understand that DEA field division  
 20 offices across the country will interest  
 21 act with registrants, true?  
 22 A. True.  
 23 Q. And DEA personnel from DEA  
 24 field offices will communicate with

1 leadership at DEA headquarters in  
 2 Washington DC to clearly communicate its  
 3 interpretation of the requirements of the  
 4 CSA and its regulations related to  
 5 suspicious order monitoring to DEA's  
 6 field offices?  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 8 answered. I'll note that every  
 9 set of attorneys has asked a  
 10 version of this question.  
 11 But you can answer again.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 13 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 14 Q. Okay. You would agree that  
 15 providing clear direction to DEA's field  
 16 divisions one of the most important  
 17 functions of the diversion control group  
 18 leadership at headquarters?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. If DEA headquarters does not  
 21 clearly communicate its interpretation of  
 22 the regulations and statutes related to  
 23 the suspicious order monitoring programs  
 24 to DEA's field offices, the field offices

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 463

1 may give inaccurate information to  
 2 registrants?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 4 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 5 Calls for speculation.  
 6 THE WITNESS: I don't -- I  
 7 don't know specifically what every  
 8 field office has provided that  
 9 guidance and oftentimes when there  
 10 is a question regarding that, we  
 11 will -- the field is instructed to  
 12 have the registrant reach out to  
 13 headquarters for an official  
 14 review.  
 15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 16 Q. Okay.  
 17 A. So the official review would  
 18 come from the headquarters side.  
 19 Q. Okay. My question is a  
 20 little bit -- I understand what you're  
 21 saying. My question is just a little bit  
 22 different.  
 23 My question is, if the field  
 24 office doesn't necessarily understand

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 465

1 A. Yes. That sounds about  
 2 right.  
 3 Q. Okay. After Mr. Rannazzisi  
 4 left DEA in 2015, DEA's leadership  
 5 recognized that it needed to make some  
 6 important changes to improve how DEA  
 7 communicated with registrants, true?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 9 Vague.  
 10 MS. SINGER: Lack of  
 11 foundation.  
 12 THE WITNESS: I mean, yeah,  
 13 yeah.  
 14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 15 Q. DEA's leadership after  
 16 Mr. Rannazzisi left DEA in 2015 wanted to  
 17 increase collaboration with registrants  
 18 to decrease diversion, correct?  
 19 A. Correct.  
 20 Q. DEA's current leadership has  
 21 acknowledged that it needs to do better  
 22 in its efforts to collaborate with  
 23 manufacturers, distributors, and retail  
 24 chain pharmacies, true?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 464

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 466

1 headquarter's position on something  
 2 related to the statute and the  
 3 regulations, there's a risk that they  
 4 could provide inaccurate information to  
 5 registrants in the field?  
 6 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 7 Calls for speculation.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'll join.  
 9 Add vague, incomplete  
 10 hypothetical.  
 11 THE WITNESS: I would -- if  
 12 they don't know, and don't ask,  
 13 then yes, hypothetically, yes.  
 14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 15 Q. All right. So let's now  
 16 talk about communications between DEA and  
 17 the registrants. All right?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. Okay. Agree that at some  
 20 point after -- well, let me strike that  
 21 and start over.  
 22 Mr. Rannazzisi ran the  
 23 diversion control group from 2006 to  
 24 about 2015, right?

1 A. I believe we all need to do  
 2 it.  
 3 Q. Okay.  
 4 A. Not just one. It's --  
 5 everybody has to be involved.  
 6 Q. My question is maybe a  
 7 little bit different than your answer.  
 8 So let me restate it.  
 9 A. Sure.  
 10 Q. DEA's current leadership has  
 11 acknowledged that it needs to do better  
 12 in its efforts to collaborate with  
 13 manufacturers, distributors and retail  
 14 chain pharmacies?  
 15 A. Correct.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Just wait.  
 17 (Document marked for  
 18 identification as Exhibit  
 19 DEA-Prevoznik-17.)  
 20 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 21 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, I'm showing  
 22 you what has been marked as Exhibit  
 23 Number 17. It is more summit -- or  
 24 congressional materials.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 467

1 This one is dated March 20,  
 2 2018. It's a hearing in front of the  
 3 subcommittee of oversight and  
 4 investigations. The committee on energy  
 5 and commerce entitled, "The Drug  
 6 Enforcement Administration's Role in  
 7 Combatting the Opioid Epidemic."  
 8 Do you see that?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. All right. I would direct  
 11 you to Page 21.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Counsel,  
 13 whose highlighting is this?  
 14 MR. STEPHENS: We can get a  
 15 clean version at a break. That  
 16 highlighting would be -- it may be  
 17 mine.  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. On Page 21 do you see in  
 21 bold in the middle of the page it talks  
 22 about DEA's lessons learned and the  
 23 response of the proliferation of CPDs?  
 24 A. Yes.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 469

1 responsibilities with its registrants, it  
 2 would help in the effort to reduce  
 3 prescription drug abuse?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 5 Incomplete hypothetical.  
 6 THE WITNESS: That's the  
 7 goal.  
 8 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 9 Q. Okay. And would you agree  
 10 that current leadership at DEA is now  
 11 willing to collaborate with registrants  
 12 who can help DEA reduce diversion?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Fair to say that DEA's  
 15 current leadership understands that  
 16 treating potential good faith  
 17 collaborators as adversaries is not an  
 18 effective way to reduce diversion?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 20 hypothetical.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 22 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 23 Q. All right. Mr. Prevoznik,  
 24 I'd like to transition a little bit here

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 468

1 Q. Okay. And if you look at  
 2 the -- the first sentence there, it  
 3 reads, "Due to the complexity of DEA's  
 4 regulatory program, the diversion control  
 5 division has worked aggressively to  
 6 improve its communication and cooperation  
 7 with its more than 1.7 million  
 8 registrants who represent medical  
 9 professionals, pharmaceutical drug  
 10 manufacturers, and those in the drug  
 11 chain" -- "drug supply chain."  
 12 Do you see that?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Have I read that accurately?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Okay. And -- and this is a  
 17 statement indicating that DEA's  
 18 leadership in March 20th of 2018 was  
 19 working aggressively to improve its  
 20 communication and cooperation with  
 21 registrants, right?  
 22 A. Right.  
 23 Q. Okay. DEA also recognizes  
 24 that if it improves on its communication

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 470

1 and ask you some questions about the  
 2 internet distributor initiative,  
 3 including why DEA gave those internet  
 4 distributor initiative briefings, when  
 5 the briefings occurred and who generally  
 6 received them. Okay?  
 7 A. Sure.  
 8 Q. This is 30(b)(6) Topic 3.  
 9 Okay?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. All right. And -- and you  
 12 testified about some of this yesterday.  
 13 I'll try and go quickly through that.  
 14 All right?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. In 2006, DEA implemented the  
 17 internet distributor initiative, right?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 19 answered.  
 20 THE WITNESS: 2005.  
 21 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 22 Q. Okay. 2005, right. So DEA  
 23 implements it in 2005, right?  
 24 A. Correct.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 471

1 Q. Okay. And the -- the  
2 program is initially designed to educate  
3 wholesale distributors related to rogue  
4 internet pharmacies, and then downstream,  
5 a little bit later, it was to diverting  
6 rogue pain clinics, right?  
7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
8 answered.  
9 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
10 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
11 Q. Okay. All right. I was  
12 just trying to remind you from where we  
13 were yesterday.  
14 All right. My question is,  
15 did DEA ever have a retail chain pharmacy  
16 initiative?  
17 A. No.  
18 Q. Did DEA ever meet with CVS,  
19 Rite Aid, Walmart or Walgreens, HBC Giant  
20 Eagle, as part of DEA's internet  
21 distributor initiative?  
22 A. Not to my knowledge.  
23 Q. Okay. Now at the time, you  
24 know, taking you back to 2005, 2006, DEA

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 473

1 opioids in the eyes of DEA. And others  
2 were not rogue and did not divert  
3 opioids, correct?  
4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
5 speculation.  
6 THE WITNESS: I am not aware  
7 of any pharmacies not on the --  
8 the latter part of your question.  
9 Because not all -- not all  
10 internet pharmacies were  
11 dispensing opioids, but they could  
12 be dispensing other controlled  
13 substances, and that would be  
14 diversion of those controlled  
15 substances.  
16 (Document marked for  
17 identification as Exhibit  
18 DEA-Prevoznik-18.)  
19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
20 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, I've placed  
21 in front of you a transcript from the --  
22 a hearing before Congress dated May 16,  
23 2007. It's a hearing before the  
24 committee on the judiciary of the United

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 472

1 believed that some of these internet  
2 pharmacies were rogue pharmacies, meaning  
3 that those pharmacies were diverting  
4 opioids?  
5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
6 answered.  
7 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
8 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
9 Q. Okay. The DEA also  
10 understood that not all pharmacies  
11 operating on the internet diverted  
12 controlled substances, true?  
13 A. Correct.  
14 Q. So some internet pharmacies  
15 were rogue and diverted opioids, and  
16 other internet pharmacies were not rogue  
17 and did not divert opioids, true?  
18 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
19 Scope.  
20 THE WITNESS: Could you  
21 repeat that?  
22 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
23 Q. Sure. Some internet  
24 pharmacies were rogue and diverted

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 474

1 States Senate entitled, "Rogue Online  
2 Pharmacies: The Growing Problem of  
3 Internet Drug Trafficking."  
4 Do you see that?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. Okay. If I could direct you  
7 to Page 52.  
8 If you look at the top of  
9 Page 52, Mr. Prevoznik, it's entitled,  
10 "Rogue Online Pharmacies: The Growing  
11 Problem of Internet Drug Trafficking,"  
12 dated May 16, 2007. Questions for the  
13 hearing record for Joseph Rannazzisi,  
14 deputy assistant administrator, office of  
15 diversion control, Drug Enforcement  
16 Administration, United States Department  
17 of Justice.  
18 Do you see that?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. Okay. The very first  
21 question is from Chairman Leahy, do you  
22 see that?  
23 A. Yes.  
24 Q. And 1.a. asks:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 475

1 "Approximately how many websites  
2 currently offer to sell controlled  
3 substances illegally over the internet?"  
4 Do you see that?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. Okay. Now, if you look down  
7 towards the -- the middle of the  
8 response, there's a state -- there's a  
9 sentence that starts it should be noted.  
10 Do you see that?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. The statement reads: "It  
13 should be noted that there are legitimate  
14 pharmacies that provide controlled  
15 substances via the internet and operate  
16 daily within the boundaries of the law."  
17 Do you see that?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. Do you agree with that?  
20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
21 Calls for speculation.  
22 THE WITNESS: Yeah, this is  
23 before the Ryan-Haight Act. So,  
24 yes.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 477

1 sure what you mean by the use of  
2 the word "blame."  
3 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
4 Q. Did DEA take any action,  
5 civil, regulatory, administrative,  
6 against legitimate internet pharmacies  
7 who DEA thought was acting within the  
8 boundaries of the law for the actions of  
9 the other internet pharmacies who DEA  
10 thought were rogue and were diverting  
11 controlled substances?  
12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
13 Incomplete hypothetical.  
14 THE WITNESS: I'm not aware  
15 of it.  
16 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
17 Q. Okay. So one aspect that  
18 DEA included in its internet distributor  
19 briefing related to the percentage of  
20 controlled versus noncontrolled  
21 substances that a particular pharmacy  
22 ordered, right?  
23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
24 THE WITNESS: Correct.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 476

1 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
2 Q. Okay. So my -- my point  
3 was, some internet pharmacies in the eyes  
4 of DEA were rogue and diverted opioids --  
5 or diverted controlled substances, fair?  
6 A. Fair.  
7 Q. All right. Other online  
8 internet pharmacies were not rogue  
9 pharmacies and operated within the  
10 boundaries of the law in the eyes of DEA  
11 as of May 16, 2007, based on what DEA  
12 told the Senate, right?  
13 A. Correct.  
14 Q. Okay. Now, did DEA blame  
15 the internet pharmacies who were acting  
16 within the boundaries of the law for the  
17 actions of the rogue internet pharmacies  
18 who DEA thought were diverting  
19 prescription opioids?  
20 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
21 Scope.  
22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
23 Incomplete hypothetical.  
24 THE WITNESS: Not really

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 478

1 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
2 Q. Okay. And you testified  
3 about this a little bit yesterday, right?  
4 A. Yes.  
5 Q. Okay. All right. So I've  
6 got a few more questions related to that.  
7 I will try not to repeat the exact  
8 question.  
9 And one characteristic the  
10 DEA noticed about rogue internet  
11 pharmacies that were diverting controlled  
12 substances was an imbalance that they had  
13 between the ratio of controlled  
14 substances compared to non-controlled  
15 substances that they distributed, right?  
16 A. That would be one criteria.  
17 Yes.  
18 Q. And some of the rogue  
19 internet pharmacies that were diverting  
20 controlled substances had a ratio where  
21 they distributed 95 percent controlled  
22 substances against 5 percent  
23 non-controlled substances, right?  
24 A. Yes.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 479

1 Q. And DEA viewed a ratio of  
 2 95 percent controlled substances versus 5  
 3 percent non-controlled substances as a  
 4 possible indication that the internet  
 5 pharmacy was diverting the controlled  
 6 substances true?  
 7 A. I don't -- I don't think we  
 8 locked in on those specific numbers. I  
 9 mean, that was an example he gave of 95  
 10 and five. But we were -- we were  
 11 comparing against a brick-and-mortar  
 12 store of what typically happens there.  
 13 Q. Yeah. Okay. So -- and a  
 14 brick-and-mortar store would be like a  
 15 Walmart or CVS, a Rite Aid, HBC Giant  
 16 Eagle, CVS, right?  
 17 A. As well as independent  
 18 pharmacies as well, yes.  
 19 Q. Okay. And Walmart  
 20 pharmacies never had a ratio of  
 21 controlled to noncontrolled substances  
 22 that approached anything like the 95  
 23 percent to 5 percent ratio that the DEA  
 24 saw at some rogue internet pharmacies,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 481

1 acknowledged in presentations that it  
 2 gave that no chain pharmacies were rogue  
 3 pharmacies, right?  
 4 A. Correct.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Hang on  
 6 one second. I am just reading the  
 7 question.  
 8 Okay.  
 9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 10 Q. Your answer was "correct,"  
 11 right?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. Walmart, CVS, Rite Aid,  
 14 Walgreens, HBC Giant Eagle are all chain  
 15 pharmacies, true?  
 16 A. True.  
 17 Q. DEA is generally aware that  
 18 Walmart only distributes controlled  
 19 substances to its own Walmart store  
 20 pharmacies, right?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 22 Scope. Calls for speculation.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Well, that  
 24 just changed. But prior to the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 480

1 right?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait.  
 3 Scope, calls for speculation.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 5 knowledge.  
 6 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 7 Q. Okay. CVS, Walgreens, Rite  
 8 Aid, HBC Giant Eagle, they never had a  
 9 ratio of controlled to noncontrolled  
 10 substances that was 95 percent controlled  
 11 to 5 percent non-controlled, right?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 13 Calls for speculation.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 15 knowledge.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 17 Mr. Videographer, what's our  
 18 on-the-record time?  
 19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER:  
 20 42 minutes.  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: We're past  
 22 seven hours. So everybody knows.  
 23 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 24 Q. DEA has acknowledged and has

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 482

1 change, yes.  
 2 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 3 Q. Okay. And the change now is  
 4 that they don't distribute at all, right?  
 5 A. Correct.  
 6 Q. Okay. Walmart did not  
 7 distribute controlled substances to  
 8 internet pharmacies, right?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 10 Calls for speculation.  
 11 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
 12 I can't answer that, because I  
 13 don't know if there were any sales  
 14 store -- from the store to one of  
 15 those -- one of those potentially  
 16 rogue pharmacies.  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. I'm only talking about --  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let him  
 20 finish his answer.  
 21 MR. STEPHENS: I've let him  
 22 finish his answer.  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: No, you  
 24 haven't let him finish his answer.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 483

1 MR. STEPHENS: All morning  
 2 long.  
 3 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 4 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, have I been  
 5 interrupting you this morning?  
 6 A. I'm fine.  
 7 Q. Okay. Thank you.  
 8 CVS did not distribute  
 9 controlled substances to rogue internet  
 10 pharmacies, correct?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Again, I don't  
 13 know if there were transactions  
 14 between the -- a pharmacy to  
 15 pharmacy.  
 16 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 17 Q. I'm talking about  
 18 distribution.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 20 Incomplete hypothetical. Vague.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Well, now that  
 22 you've added distribution in that,  
 23 then no, not to my knowledge.  
 24 BY MR. STEPHENS:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 485

1 Q. And Rite Aid didn't  
 2 distribute controlled substances to  
 3 internet pharmacies, right?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 5 I instruct you not to  
 6 answer.  
 7 MR. STEPHENS: What's the  
 8 basis for that?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: It's  
 10 outside the scope. You've spent  
 11 more than seven hours with this  
 12 witness. Ask questions within the  
 13 scope of the deposition that is.  
 14 MS. MAINIGI:  
 15 Mr. Finkelstein, if I may just  
 16 note on the record. I don't know  
 17 what relevance seven hours has and  
 18 why you continue to reference  
 19 seven hours to this particular  
 20 deposition. The manner in which  
 21 the time is calculated, as you  
 22 know, was per Judge Cohen --  
 23 Special Master Cohen's order.  
 24 The seven hours is

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 484

1 Q. My question, Mr. Prevoznik,  
 2 just to reconfirm, all deal with  
 3 distribution here.  
 4 A. Okay.  
 5 Q. Okay. So I'll re-ask it. I  
 6 think we got an answer. But let me  
 7 re-ask it so the record is clear.  
 8 CVS did not distribute  
 9 controlled substances to rogue internet  
 10 pharmacies right?  
 11 A. Not --  
 12 MS. SINGER: Objection  
 13 scope.  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait, Tom.  
 15 Scope. Incomplete  
 16 hypothetical. Vague. We're past  
 17 seven hours, and you're still  
 18 outside the scope. I'm going to  
 19 start instructing him not to  
 20 answer.  
 21 You can answer this time.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 23 knowledge.  
 24 BY MR. STEPHENS:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 486

1 irrelevant. I think it would  
 2 certainly be relevant in that we  
 3 wouldn't want to burden the  
 4 witness by going longer than seven  
 5 hours, perhaps, in the course of  
 6 one particular day. But I don't  
 7 think there's any need, the  
 8 morning of the deposition, to keep  
 9 referencing seven hours.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You've  
 11 noted your position that the seven  
 12 hours is irrelevant. My  
 13 instruction stands. And we can  
 14 revisit this with the special  
 15 master.  
 16 MS. MAINIGI: If there's  
 17 something to revisit, we're happy  
 18 to do that. I don't see anything  
 19 to revisit.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Good. I  
 21 agree.  
 22 THE REPORTER: You have to  
 23 speak up. There's no mic.  
 24 MR. KOBRIN: Sorry. I'm

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 487

1 Josh Kobrin for HBC. Mr. Stephens  
 2 is representing all of the chain  
 3 pharmacies. And to cut him off  
 4 when he's trying to ask questions  
 5 on behalf of all those chain  
 6 pharmacies when he's in the middle  
 7 of a question that is clearly not  
 8 a hypothetical. On the basis that  
 9 it's a hypothetical, is totally  
 10 improper.  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Your  
 12 objection is noted.  
 13 MR. STEPHENS: I would also  
 14 note that the answers that the  
 15 witness started with this morning  
 16 about diversion, where to -- who  
 17 diverts is relevant to the  
 18 adequacy of a SOMs program, and  
 19 where diversion occurs being  
 20 relevant to the adequacy of a SOMs  
 21 program, and to -- to assess a  
 22 suspicious order, where the  
 23 shipment goes and it's distributed  
 24 to is relevant, puts me well

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 489

1 you not to answer.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Tom. Tom.  
 4 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 5 Q. Walmart -- Walgreens did not  
 6 distribute controlled substances to  
 7 internet pharmacies, correct?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Instruct  
 9 you not to answer.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Taking the  
 11 advice of my attorney.  
 12 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 13 Q. HBC Giant Eagle did not  
 14 distribute controlled substances to  
 15 internet pharmacies, correct?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Instruct  
 17 you not to answer.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Following my  
 19 attorney's instructions.  
 20 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 21 Q. Okay. Mr. Prevoznik,  
 22 after -- you mentioned the Ryan-Haight  
 23 Act in 2008, right?  
 24 A. Correct.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 488

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 490

1 within Topic Number 2 and Topic  
 2 Number 3, that deal with DEA's  
 3 interpretation and enforcement of  
 4 the Controlled Substances Act, its  
 5 regulations, what is suspicious,  
 6 know your customer, and DEA's  
 7 guidance on the adequacy of a SOMs  
 8 program.  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let -- let  
 10 me answer. You are asking him  
 11 what a specific retail chain  
 12 pharmacy actually does in  
 13 operation. That's outside the  
 14 scope, and I've instructed him not  
 15 to answer that question.  
 16 You can ask your next  
 17 question.  
 18 MR. STEPHENS: Who they  
 19 distribute to.  
 20 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 21 Q. Rite Aid did not distribute  
 22 controlled substances to internet  
 23 pharmacies, correct?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Instruct

1 Q. Okay. The Ryan-Haight Act  
 2 in 2008 dealt with a legislative attempt  
 3 to try and deal with the problem that DEA  
 4 was seeing with rogue internet  
 5 pharmacies, fair?  
 6 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 7 Scope.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 10 Q. Okay. So I'm again going to  
 11 ask you some questions about where DEA  
 12 saw diversion occurring, okay?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. Now, the -- after the  
 15 Ryan-Haight Act, DEA took some  
 16 enforcement actions against rogue  
 17 internet pharmacies, right?  
 18 A. Yes. As -- as well as some  
 19 distributors.  
 20 Q. Okay. And -- and after  
 21 that, in the 2008-2009 time period, DEA  
 22 began to see issues with rogue pain  
 23 clinics, right?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 491

1 answered.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 3 MR. STEPHENS: I'm just  
 4 trying to set the time frame for  
 5 the witness.  
 6 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 7 Q. Do you understand what I'm  
 8 saying, Mr. Prevoznik?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Okay. All right. So it was  
 11 in the -- in -- approximate time frames  
 12 here, and clarify to whatever degree you  
 13 feel you need to, Mr. Prevoznik. But  
 14 roughly in 2009, 2010, and shortly after  
 15 that, the DEA started to have more issues  
 16 with rogue pain clinics, right?  
 17 A. Correct.  
 18 Q. Okay. Did DEA ever conduct  
 19 a distributor briefing with retail chain  
 20 pharmacies related to rogue pain clinics?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 22 answered.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 24 BY MR. STEPHENS:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 493

1 by the rogue pain clinics?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 3 Vague.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Not that I'm  
 5 aware of.  
 6 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 7 Q. Okay. And like the rogue  
 8 internet pharmacies that preceded them,  
 9 these rogue pain clinics that were  
 10 diverting controlled substances typically  
 11 distributed a lopsided ratio of  
 12 controlled substances to noncontrolled  
 13 substances?  
 14 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 15 Scope.  
 16 THE WITNESS: To my -- yes.  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. Okay. The -- rogue pain  
 19 clinics were not full service pharmacies  
 20 like a retail chain pharmacy like Walmart  
 21 or CVS, Rite Aid or Walgreens, right?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 23 speculation. Foundation.  
 24 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 492

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 494

1 Q. Okay. So now like rogue --  
 2 or I'm sorry, strike that. Let me re-ask  
 3 the question.  
 4 Like internet pharmacies,  
 5 DEA -- DEA would agree that not all pain  
 6 clinics diverted controlled substances?  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 8 speculation. Asked and answered.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 10 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 11 Q. Okay. There was some good  
 12 pain clinics who operated within the  
 13 boundaries of the law and there were some  
 14 rogue pain clinics that operated outside  
 15 the boundaries of the law.  
 16 Is that fair?  
 17 MS. SINGER: Same objections  
 18 as to scope of the questioning  
 19 here.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 22 Q. Okay. Did DEA file any  
 23 lawsuits against the good pain clinics to  
 24 try and make them pay for the harm caused

1 what you mean by --  
 2 MS. SINGER: Objection as to  
 3 scope.  
 4 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 5 Q. All right. So rogue pain  
 6 clinics didn't sell cornflakes, greeting  
 7 cards, Oreo cookies, that type thing,  
 8 right?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 10 speculation.  
 11 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 12 Scope.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 15 Q. Okay. But retail chain  
 16 pharmacies do sell a full service of  
 17 other things to their customers, right?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 19 speculation.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 22 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, if I could  
 23 I'd like to transition to Topic Number 9  
 24 which -- of your 30(b)(6), which relates

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 495

1 to ARCOS. Okay?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. And I'd like to ask you a  
 4 few questions about why DEA processes and  
 5 analyzes ARCOS data to identify and stop  
 6 sources of diversion.  
 7 Okay?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. Okay. So -- and you've  
 10 answered some questions about ARCOS  
 11 yesterday, right?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. Okay. So I'll try not to  
 14 re-ask those. I'll do the best I can.  
 15 I'll -- I may have to touch on some of  
 16 them just to set where I'm going with the  
 17 other questions that I want to ask.  
 18 All right?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. Okay. So yesterday you  
 21 mentioned that the ARCOS database has the  
 22 ability to generate investigative leads  
 23 that DEA could pursue proactively to  
 24 discover the identity of individuals

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 497

1 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 2 Q. And more proactive  
 3 investigations of potential diverters  
 4 should result in more actions filed  
 5 against suspected diverters?  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 7 hypothetical.  
 8 THE WITNESS: What kind of  
 9 actions?  
 10 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 11 Q. Any. Admin, civil,  
 12 criminal.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same --  
 14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 15 Q. Basically, the more leads  
 16 you have, the more cases you can make,  
 17 right?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 19 objection.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 22 Q. More leads is a good thing  
 23 for an investigator, right?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 496

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 498

1 responsible for diverting opioids, true?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Letting  
 3 this go for now. You can answer.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 5 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 6 Q. And those ARCOS leads could  
 7 be helpful to DEA's efforts in the field,  
 8 right?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. And that would support DEA's  
 11 mission to prevent diversion where it's  
 12 occurring, right?  
 13 A. It points to it. It might  
 14 not just be that source. There's going  
 15 to be other issues as well, so...  
 16 Q. Would you agree with a  
 17 general principle that more investigative  
 18 leads generated by ARCOS would equate to  
 19 more proactive investigations of  
 20 potential diverters?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 22 hypothetical.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yeah. It's a  
 24 point.

1 objection.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 4 Q. All right. So let me ask  
 5 you a few questions about DEA's procedure  
 6 regarding who at DEA processes the ARCOS  
 7 data to generate the leads to identify  
 8 and stop diversion, okay?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Topic 9 in your 30(b)(6)  
 11 designation.  
 12 Yesterday you testified  
 13 that, as I understand it, there are  
 14 currently ten employees who work on the  
 15 ARCOS unit that analyzes the data; is  
 16 that right?  
 17 A. Yeah. Yes, they analyze the  
 18 data.  
 19 Q. Four input, and six output,  
 20 right?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Okay. The six output, would  
 23 those be the DEA employees who analyze  
 24 the data to put out to the field

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 499

1 proactive investigative leads that the  
 2 field can use? Am I understanding that?  
 3 A. Actually, the field has  
 4 access to it as well. So the field can  
 5 generate their own leads off it. So  
 6 our -- the group at headquarters assists  
 7 with -- assists -- often assists with  
 8 case investigations as well. So the  
 9 leads could come from either the field  
 10 themselves, the field investigators  
 11 themselves, or they may come from our  
 12 group at headquarters.  
 13 So it's a combination of  
 14 either source that would -- that could  
 15 potentiate those leads. So I know it's  
 16 not one particular group that does it.  
 17 There's various people doing it all  
 18 across the field.  
 19 Q. All right. Are you done?  
 20 A. Mm-hmm.  
 21 Q. Okay. I just wanted to make  
 22 sure I didn't interrupt you.  
 23 And my question may be more  
 24 artfully framed. Can you describe for me

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 501

1 data that comes from the registrants, and  
 2 then it -- through case support with the  
 3 field and with investigations, they do  
 4 the online statistical reports that we  
 5 upload. They respond to FOIAAs. They  
 6 respond to doing -- for presentations.  
 7 They also do assessments,  
 8 trends assessments. They also do threat  
 9 assessments for the field. So that's  
 10 part of our -- building our scheduled  
 11 work plan. So it's a variety of  
 12 different things that that group does.  
 13 Q. Okay. That's helpful.  
 14 Thank you.  
 15 So there are ten people  
 16 there currently, right?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 18 answered.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 21 Q. Okay. And you supervised  
 22 this group for a while? Did you  
 23 supervise these ten employees for a  
 24 while?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 500

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 502

1 the difference between the duties that  
 2 the four input analysts have at DEA  
 3 headquarters and compare that against the  
 4 duties that the six output employees have  
 5 at headquarters?  
 6 A. Sure. So the input duties  
 7 are -- that's the uploaded, as the  
 8 registrants upload their data. They --  
 9 that's what the input side does. They  
 10 deal with the -- to ensure that the data  
 11 is going in correctly, that errors are  
 12 being fixed. There's constant  
 13 communication with the registrants on,  
 14 you know, you have to fix these errors.  
 15 Is this what you meant? If they see  
 16 anomalies, they will call the registrant,  
 17 say, you know, your decimal point looks  
 18 like it may be off. Could you look at  
 19 your data?  
 20 And so there's that constant  
 21 communication to try to verify that what  
 22 they're reporting is true and accurate.  
 23 So that's the input side.  
 24 The output side takes that

1 A. I was never their direct  
 2 supervisor. I'm a step higher.  
 3 Q. Okay. No, I understand that  
 4 you're senior in the org chart. I'm just  
 5 trying to make sure that I understand at  
 6 some point these ten people were in your  
 7 reporting chain of command.  
 8 A. Yes, that's correct.  
 9 Q. Okay. They are not  
 10 currently?  
 11 A. Correct.  
 12 Q. Okay. All right. Has the  
 13 number -- and what's this -- what's this  
 14 unit called, this ARCOS unit, what does  
 15 DEA call it?  
 16 A. ARCOS unit or targeting and  
 17 analysis.  
 18 Q. Okay. So if I call it the  
 19 ARCOS unit you understand what I'm  
 20 talking about?  
 21 A. Correct.  
 22 Q. Okay. All right. It  
 23 currently has ten employees. How many  
 24 employees did the -- this ARCOS unit have

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 503

1 in, say, 2015?  
 2 A. I'd speculate, because I  
 3 wasn't up there at that point. But  
 4 probably about ten.  
 5 Q. Okay. Can you identify any  
 6 period during your time at DEA where it  
 7 had more -- that the ARCOS unit had more  
 8 than ten employees on it?  
 9 A. Oh, I'm sorry. What I meant  
 10 by ten, you had ten in the output side  
 11 and you had about three on the input  
 12 side. So it was a slight increase. I  
 13 know -- I believe we're three under right  
 14 now on our organizational chart.  
 15 Q. So -- and you've been in DEA  
 16 for -- since '91?  
 17 A. Yeah.  
 18 Q. Okay. And just -- can you  
 19 identify any period of time between 2006  
 20 and 2015 where this ARCOS unit had more  
 21 than ten people working on it?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 23 answered.  
 24 THE WITNESS: I don't know.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 505

1 come in. It's usually we are working  
 2 together through it --  
 3 Q. Okay.  
 4 A. -- as --  
 5 Q. Describe for me the  
 6 difference --  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait. Let  
 8 him finish his answer.  
 9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 10 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, was I  
 11 interrupting you?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You just  
 13 did interrupt him.  
 14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 15 Q. I'm sorry. Did you feel  
 16 that I was interrupting you?  
 17 A. I'm fine.  
 18 Q. Okay. Thank you.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: The record  
 20 is going to reflect that he didn't  
 21 finish his answer. And I'm asking  
 22 counsel please let him finish his  
 23 answer.  
 24 BY MR. STEPHENS:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 504

1 I don't know.  
 2 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 3 Q. Okay. So DEA currently uses  
 4 ARCOS data in a proactive way to identify  
 5 targets to investigate for diverting  
 6 prescription opioids, right?  
 7 A. Correct.  
 8 Q. And in DEA terms, a  
 9 proactive investigation is where DEA  
 10 would identify a target and build a  
 11 forward-looking case using investigative  
 12 tools at DEA's disposal, right?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 16 Q. Okay. And in contrast, a  
 17 reactive case is a situation where a  
 18 diversion investigator may have already  
 19 built a case and then, you know looks to  
 20 ARCOS for some information to confirm its  
 21 case against someone that's already been  
 22 built out, right?  
 23 A. I wouldn't say that it's all  
 24 the way to, like, the conclusion where we

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 506

1 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, I'll work  
 2 with you all day long to let you finish  
 3 your answers. If you don't think I am, I  
 4 apologize. All right?  
 5 A. I'm good.  
 6 Q. Okay. Thank you. All  
 7 right. I'm just trying to understand in  
 8 DEA land what the difference is between  
 9 proactive and reactive, right.  
 10 So how would you describe  
 11 and define what reactive means?  
 12 A. Well, to me reactive would  
 13 be the field generated. So they are  
 14 turning to the ARCOS unit to say hey, I'm  
 15 either at the beginning part, middle  
 16 part, or I need charts. The U.S.  
 17 attorneys asked me to get charts on this.  
 18 So that would be reactive.  
 19 Proactive would be something  
 20 that that group puts out.  
 21 Q. Right. I got it.  
 22 One is an existing  
 23 investigation. They are just trying to  
 24 confirm something through the use of

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 507

1 ARCOS. And another one would be a  
2 proactive lead generated from  
3 headquarters to try and build a case,  
4 right? Like a threat assessment.  
5 A. Correct.  
6 Q. A threat assessment would be  
7 a proactive use of ARCOS, right?  
8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
9 Vague.  
10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
11 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
12 Q. And in your view, producing  
13 threat assessments to the field is a good  
14 thing?  
15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
16 Vague.  
17 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
18 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
19 Q. Between 2006 and 2015, under  
20 the leadership of Joe Rannazzisi, ARCOS  
21 analysts did not provide quarterly threat  
22 assessments to the 22 field divisions at  
23 DEA, right?  
24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 509

1 time to take a break, or soon?  
2 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
3 Q. You okay? I've got -- I've  
4 got a little bit more on these topics.  
5 A. About five minutes?  
6 About five minutes?  
7 Q. Okay. Yeah, just let me  
8 know.  
9 A. I just need a break.  
10 Q. Okay.  
11 All right. So I've got some  
12 additional questions that will focus on  
13 the 2006 to 2015 time period. Okay? As  
14 it relates to ARCOS.  
15 A. Yes.  
16 Q. Fair to say that DEA's  
17 current leadership has improved how DEA  
18 uses ARCOS data in its diversion  
19 investigations after Mr. Rannazzisi  
20 retired in 2015?  
21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
22 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure  
23 what you mean by improvements.  
24 BY MR. STEPHENS:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 508

1 You can answer.  
2 THE WITNESS: Well, again,  
3 we -- in 2010 when we all went off  
4 the mainframe, the field had -- I  
5 mean, we always had access to  
6 ARCOS, so you did have the field  
7 generating their own leads. So  
8 they -- that -- that's what they  
9 would do. They would use that  
10 data for that.  
11 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
12 Q. Okay. All right. My  
13 question is a little bit different. I  
14 understand your response. My question is  
15 a little bit different.  
16 Between 2006 and 2015 under  
17 the leadership of Joe Rannazzisi, the  
18 ARCOS group at DEA headquarters did not  
19 provide quarterly threat assessments to  
20 the field divisions at DEA, true?  
21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
22 THE WITNESS: To my  
23 knowledge, you're right.  
24 MS. SINGER: Is this a good

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 510

1 Q. Well, like using threat  
2 assessments and sending those to the  
3 field. You view those as a good thing,  
4 right?  
5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
7 Vague.  
8 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
9 Q. And that happened after  
10 Mr. Rannazzisi left in 2015, right?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. And the purpose of putting  
13 those threat assessments out to the field  
14 division is the hope that they will  
15 reduce diversion, right?  
16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
17 THE WITNESS: Yes. But I do  
18 want to emphasize that ARCOS is  
19 not the only system that we use to  
20 send -- that's analyzed to send  
21 field -- leads out to the field.  
22 I mean there's other databases  
23 that we use and we work with other  
24 federal agencies and share data.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 511

1 So ARCOS is just a -- one part of  
 2 a vast array of analysis that's  
 3 used.  
 4 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 5 Q. Okay. Between 2006 and 2015  
 6 under Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did  
 7 DEA have any published policy about what  
 8 happens after an ARCOS lead is generated?  
 9 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 10 Q. Between 2006 and 2015, under  
 11 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 12 any process where it maintained any  
 13 report indicating how many ARCOS leads  
 14 were sent to DEA field investigations for  
 15 investigation?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 18 knowledge.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. Between 2006 and 2015, under  
 21 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 22 any process where it maintained any  
 23 report indicating how many ARCOS leads  
 24 were actually investigated at the field

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 513

1 suspension orders DEA obtained based on  
 2 ARCOS leads?  
 3 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 4 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 5 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 6 any process where it maintained any  
 7 report indicating how many orders to show  
 8 cause DEA generated based on ARCOS leads?  
 9 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 10 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 11 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 12 any process where it maintained any  
 13 report indicating how many convictions  
 14 DEA obtained of diverters based on ARCOS  
 15 leads?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 18 knowledge.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 21 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 22 any process where it maintained any  
 23 report indicating how many indictments  
 24 DEA returned following ARCOS leads that

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 512

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 514

1 division level?  
 2 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 3 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 4 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 5 any process where it maintained any  
 6 report indicating how many ARCOS leads  
 7 were referred out but not by DEA  
 8 headquarters, but not investigated at the  
 9 field division level?  
 10 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 11 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 12 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 13 any process where it maintained any  
 14 report indicating how many ARCOS leads  
 15 resulted in formal actions by DEA against  
 16 suspected diverters?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 19 knowledge.  
 20 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 21 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 22 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 23 any process where it maintained any  
 24 report indicating how many immediate

1 had been generated?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 4 knowledge.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Seems like  
 6 we are at a pause. Can we take a  
 7 break?  
 8 MR. STEPHENS: Sure.  
 9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 9:27. We  
 10 are off the video record.  
 11 (Short break.)  
 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 9:48. We  
 13 are on the video record.  
 14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 15 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, let me ask  
 16 you a couple quick questions and then  
 17 I'll get back into ARCOS.  
 18 Okay?  
 19 A. Sure.  
 20 Q. You had mentioned at the  
 21 start today that you had looked at DEA's  
 22 website and figured out a couple  
 23 conferences. You gave us that  
 24 information, right?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 515

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. Okay. As to the 2007  
 3 conference in Houston, you were not  
 4 physically present at that conference,  
 5 right?  
 6 A. Correct.  
 7 Q. You did not attend, correct?  
 8 A. Correct.  
 9 Q. Okay. All right.  
 10 Now, one other question.  
 11 Does a nonregisterant have an obligation  
 12 to maintain effective controls to prevent  
 13 diversion?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 15 THE WITNESS: A  
 16 nonregisterant?  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. Right.  
 19 A. They're not within the  
 20 closed system of distribution.  
 21 Q. Okay. So they have no duty  
 22 to maintain effective controls to prevent  
 23 diversion, correct?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 517

1 explain that?  
 2 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 3 Q. Sure. Pattern evaluation  
 4 test is a qualitative measure by which  
 5 you look at a computer program and try  
 6 and determine whether what the output is,  
 7 is of high quality or suboptimal quality.  
 8 Was DEA doing anything along those lines  
 9 between 2006 and 2015 as it related to  
 10 ARCOS data?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 12 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
 13 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 14 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 15 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 16 any procedure that required DEA special  
 17 agent in charges in the various field  
 18 divisions to report back to DEA  
 19 headquarters to give process reports  
 20 about what the field division had done to  
 21 investigate ARCOS leads?  
 22 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 23 Q. Okay. And just for  
 24 definitional purposes, each DEA field

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 516

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 518

1 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 2 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 3 Q. All right. Turning back to  
 4 ARCOS. Between 2006 and 2015, did DEA  
 5 maintain any report that would show how  
 6 many ARCOS leads got sent to DEA offices  
 7 in Ohio in any particular year?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 10 knowledge during that particular  
 11 period, and we don't do it today,  
 12 so...  
 13 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 14 Q. Okay. Between 2006 and  
 15 2015, did DEA have any process that  
 16 required the ARCOS team to run pattern  
 17 evaluation tests to verify whether ARCOS  
 18 was generating high quality investigative  
 19 leads as opposed to suboptimal  
 20 investigative leads?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 22 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 23 Foundation.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Could you

1 position has a number one agent that runs  
 2 that field division. That agent's title  
 3 is a special agent in charge, the SAC,  
 4 right?  
 5 A. Correct.  
 6 Q. SAC. Correct. Was there  
 7 any policy at DEA between 2006 and 2015  
 8 that would have prevented the deputy  
 9 administrator in charge of diversion  
 10 control from instituting that procedure?  
 11 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 12 Q. Between 2006 and 2015, did  
 13 DEA have any procedure that prevented a  
 14 field -- that prevents a field division  
 15 from simply ignoring ARCOS information  
 16 sent to them by DEA headquarters?  
 17 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 18 Q. Was there anything  
 19 preventing the deputy administrator in  
 20 charge of diversion control,  
 21 Mr. Rannazzisi, from instituting a  
 22 process to ensure that DEA's field  
 23 divisions would not ignore ARCOS leads in  
 24 their work?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 519

1 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 2 Foundation.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 4 Foundation. Misstates his title.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 6 knowledge.  
 7 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 8 Q. Did the diversion control  
 9 group under Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership  
 10 ever form an ARCOS review committee to  
 11 analyze ARCOS data for leads to identify  
 12 where diversion was occurring?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 15 please repeat that?  
 16 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 17 Q. Sure. Did the diversion  
 18 control group under Mr. Rannazzisi's  
 19 leadership from 2006 to 2015 ever form an  
 20 ARCOS review committee to analyze ARCOS  
 21 data for leads to identify where  
 22 diversion was occurring?  
 23 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 24 Foundation.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 521

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 3 knowledge.  
 4 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 5 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 6 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA ever  
 7 institute any procedure whereby field  
 8 divisions needed to establish an ARCOS  
 9 review committee to analyze the leads  
 10 received from DEA to assess how those  
 11 leads could stop diversion?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 13 answered. Vague.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 15 knowledge.  
 16 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 17 Q. Was there any policy at DEA  
 18 between 2006 and 2015 that would have  
 19 prevented Mr. Rannazzisi, who ran the  
 20 diversion control group, from instituting  
 21 a procedure where the field divisions  
 22 needed to establish an ARCOS review  
 23 committee to analyze the leads  
 24 received -- or any leads received from

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 520

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 522

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 2 objection.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 4 knowledge.  
 5 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 6 Q. Okay. Between 2006 and  
 7 2015, under Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership,  
 8 did DEA ever institute any procedure  
 9 whereby field divisions were required to  
 10 establish an ARCOS review committee to  
 11 analyze any ARCOS leads or information  
 12 received by the field from DEA  
 13 headquarters to assess how that  
 14 information from ARCOS could identify  
 15 where diversion was occurring in that  
 16 district?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 19 knowledge.  
 20 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 21 Q. Was there any policy at the  
 22 Drug Enforcement Administration between  
 23 2006 and 2015 that would have prevented  
 24 Mr. Rannazzisi from doing so?

1 DEA headquarters to assess how those  
 2 leads could stop diversion?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 4 answered.  
 5 MS. SINGER: Same objection  
 6 to lack of foundation.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 8 knowledge.  
 9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 10 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 11 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA  
 12 headquarters ever institute a procedure  
 13 where it placed diversion investigators  
 14 at DEA headquarters as opposed to a field  
 15 division who would be responsible for  
 16 conducting proactive investigations based  
 17 on leads generated by ARCOS?  
 18 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 19 Foundation.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 22 please repeat that?  
 23 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 24 Q. Sure.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 523

1 Between 2006 and 2015, under  
 2 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership of the  
 3 diversion control group, did DEA  
 4 headquarters under Mr. Rannazzisi's  
 5 leadership ever institute a procedure  
 6 where it placed diversion investigators  
 7 at DEA headquarters as opposed to being  
 8 housed in a field division who would be  
 9 responsible for conducting proactive  
 10 investigations based on leads generated  
 11 by ARCOS?  
 12 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 13 THE WITNESS: At one point  
 14 there were no DIs in the ARCOS  
 15 unit. But there are -- there were  
 16 DIs placed in the ARCOS unit  
 17 during that period. Kyle Wright  
 18 was one. Nancy Jackson was one.  
 19 Noreen Valentine was one. So the  
 20 investigators were placed into  
 21 that unit.  
 22 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 23 Q. That's three. Can you  
 24 identify any others?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 525

1 to repeat the question. That's all.  
 2 Q. No, fair. I know you do.  
 3 And I'm going to. I'm just trying to  
 4 give you a little basis of the -- why I'm  
 5 asking the question.  
 6 My question is, if  
 7 Mr. Rannazzisi was concerned that ARCOS  
 8 leads were being ignored by the field  
 9 divisions, he could have assembled a full  
 10 team of DEA's diversion investigators and  
 11 stationed that squad at DEA headquarters  
 12 under his direct command to pursue ARCOS  
 13 leads, true?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 15 hypothetical. Foundation.  
 16 THE WITNESS: He could do  
 17 that if he felt that. But I don't  
 18 know if he ever felt that.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. Okay. He never did that,  
 21 right?  
 22 A. He never did that, and we  
 23 still haven't done that.  
 24 Q. Okay. Between 2006 and 2015

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 524

1 A. Not off the top of my head.  
 2 Q. Okay. If -- if the deputy  
 3 administrator in charge of the diversion  
 4 control group was concerned that ARCOS  
 5 information was being ignored by the  
 6 field division, he could have assembled a  
 7 full squad of diversion investigators,  
 8 stationed them at DEA headquarters under  
 9 his direct command to pursue that ARCOS  
 10 information, true?  
 11 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 12 Foundation.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 14 hypothetical. Calls for  
 15 speculation.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 17 please repeat that.  
 18 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 19 Q. Yeah. This is just -- it's  
 20 like a structural org chart-related-type  
 21 question. Okay, Mr. Prevoznik?  
 22 A. Mm-hmm.  
 23 Q. Verbal. Okay?  
 24 A. I gotcha. I just want you

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 526

1 under Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did  
 2 DEA headquarters ever institute a  
 3 procedure where it placed diversion  
 4 investigators at headquarters as opposed  
 5 to a field division who would be  
 6 responsible for investigating suspicious  
 7 order report leads?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I withdraw  
 9 my objection.  
 10 THE WITNESS: So for -- our  
 11 investigations are -- are usually  
 12 from the field, so the field is  
 13 investigating, headquarters does  
 14 not investigate. We support and  
 15 help coordinate a case. So the  
 16 actual investigation is done at  
 17 the field level, not at  
 18 headquarters.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. Okay. So if I understand  
 21 your response, your response to my  
 22 question is no, headquarters never  
 23 instituted a procedure where it placed  
 24 diversion investigators at headquarters

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 527

1 as opposed to a field division who would  
 2 then be responsible for investigating  
 3 suspicious order report leads, correct?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Do you  
 5 understand counsel's question?  
 6 THE WITNESS: I do now.  
 7 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay. You  
 9 can answer counsel's question.  
 10 THE WITNESS: No, we did not  
 11 put anything in there.  
 12 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 13 Q. Okay. I apologize. I've  
 14 got a double negative here that I just  
 15 want to confirm. I know what you're  
 16 saying I think, but let me make sure I've  
 17 got a clean record. Okay?  
 18 Between 2006 and 2015, did  
 19 DEA ever institute a procedure where it  
 20 placed diversion investigators at DEA  
 21 headquarters as opposed to a field  
 22 division to investigate suspicious order  
 23 report leads?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 529

1 ARCOS analysis. Now you're asking  
 2 about SORs, right?  
 3 MR. STEPHENS: I just had  
 4 that one question on SORs because  
 5 it was similar to the ARCOS  
 6 question.  
 7 I will be asking him about  
 8 SORs which is another 30(b)(6)  
 9 topic here in a little bit,  
 10 counsel.  
 11 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 12 Q. All right. Let's return  
 13 back to ARCOS.  
 14 Okay, Mr. Prevoznik?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Yesterday, you had mentioned  
 17 in 2018 DEA changed its process to  
 18 provide more information out to  
 19 registrants that related to ARCOS  
 20 information?  
 21 MR. FARRELL: Objection.  
 22 Foundation.  
 23 MR. STEPHENS: I'm just  
 24 trying to -- to get back to where

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 528

1 answered.  
 2 THE WITNESS: No.  
 3 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 4 Q. If a deputy administrator  
 5 who ran division control from 2006 to  
 6 2015 was concerned that suspicious order  
 7 report leads were being ignored by the  
 8 field divisions, he could have assembled  
 9 a team of DEA's diversion investigators,  
 10 placed that squad at DEA headquarters  
 11 under his command to pursue those leads,  
 12 right?  
 13 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 14 Lack of foundation.  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 16 hypothetical. Lack of foundation.  
 17 THE WITNESS: So he could  
 18 have done that. He didn't do it.  
 19 And we still haven't done it.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Can I just  
 21 make sure I'm following this?  
 22 Because I want to make an  
 23 appropriate objection.  
 24 Before you were asking about

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 530

1 we were yesterday.  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 3 Mischaracterizes prior testimony.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Are you  
 5 referring to the ARCOS tool?  
 6 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 7 Q. Yes.  
 8 So you testified yesterday  
 9 about an ARCOS tool in 2018, right?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. Okay. I'm going to give you  
 12 what my understanding of your testimony  
 13 was. You tell me if I've got anything  
 14 wrong. Okay?  
 15 My understanding of what you  
 16 testified yesterday was in 2018, DEA  
 17 leadership decided to provide some more  
 18 information out to registrants from the  
 19 ARCOS database that DEA had. Is that  
 20 fair?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Okay. And the information  
 23 that DEA decided to provide, and this  
 24 was -- I'm sorry. Strike that and re-ask

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 531

1 a new question.  
2 This was one of your ideas,  
3 right?  
4 A. Yes.  
5 Q. Okay. And this was one of  
6 your ideas because you were trying to  
7 reduce diversion, right?  
8 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
9 Foundation.  
10 THE WITNESS: Yeah -- yes.  
11 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
12 Q. Okay. The information in  
13 2018 that DEA decided to share was with  
14 other -- with other distributors -- was  
15 whether other -- let me strike it and  
16 restate it.  
17 And I'm going to -- I'm  
18 going to use like Distributor A,  
19 Distributor B, and Distributor C just for  
20 illustrative purposes.  
21 Okay, Mr. Prevoznik?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. The information that DEA  
24 decided to provide in 2018 to a

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 533

1 was being provided? Do I have that  
2 right?  
3 A. Almost.  
4 Q. Okay. Tell me what --  
5 A. Because it would include  
6 you.  
7 Q. Okay. So you would then --  
8 we've got A, B, C and D, right, that's  
9 four?  
10 A. Correct.  
11 Q. So at -- in 2018, what DEA  
12 would tell me, Distributor A, is there  
13 are four distributors including yourself  
14 who are supplying Customer A; is that  
15 right?  
16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Hang on.  
17 Objection, Counsel. It -- it was  
18 Customer A first --  
19 MR. STEPHENS: Well, I'm --  
20 then I may have misspoken.  
21 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
22 Q. I don't think I did. Let me  
23 restate it, Mr. Prevoznik, and just tell  
24 me if I've got it wrong.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 532

1 registrant was the number of other  
2 distributors who were supplying a  
3 particular customer, true?  
4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
5 Mischaracterizes.  
6 THE WITNESS: It -- it's --  
7 it doesn't have to be a  
8 distributor. It's a supplier. So  
9 it could be manufacturer too. So  
10 whoever supplied that base code of  
11 drug, it would give the numerical  
12 of how many suppliers.  
13 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
14 Q. Right. Right. So let me  
15 state it this way, and you just tell me  
16 if I've got it right or I got it wrong.  
17 In 2018, if I'm  
18 Distributor A, and I'm supplying  
19 Customer A, and Distributors B, C, and D  
20 are supplying the same Customer A, DEA  
21 would tell me, Distributor A, there are  
22 three other distributors supplying  
23 Customer A.  
24 That's the information that

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 534

1 In 2018, the change that was  
2 made was DEA would now tell Distributor A  
3 that there are four distributors  
4 including yourself who are supplying  
5 Customer A; is that right?  
6 A. Correct.  
7 Q. Okay.  
8 A. If I could --  
9 Q. Yeah.  
10 A. -- just based on the base  
11 code. Drug base code.  
12 Q. Okay. And what do you mean  
13 by that?  
14 A. Like hydrocodone. It's not  
15 going into specific products. It's  
16 hydrocodone.  
17 Q. Okay. In 2018, DEA did not  
18 tell me, Distributor A, the quantities  
19 that were being supplied to Customer A by  
20 Distributor B, C, and D, correct?  
21 A. Correct.  
22 Q. In 2019, DEA amended its  
23 process and now provides that  
24 information?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 535

1 A. Yes. De-identified.  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Note for  
 3 the record that the witness wasn't  
 4 authorized to testify about  
 5 decisions on or after  
 6 February 2018. But as the witness  
 7 is knowledgeable, I'll allow  
 8 testimony.  
 9 MR. STEPHENS: And -- and,  
 10 Counsel, for your benefit, I'm  
 11 just trying to identify time  
 12 frames and all that so the record  
 13 is complete. That's it.  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 15 MR. FARRELL: The plaintiffs  
 16 continue their objection to any  
 17 attempt by you to establish  
 18 evidence that's probative of your  
 19 affirmative defenses and  
 20 prejudicial to our case in chief.  
 21 MR. STEPHENS: I understand  
 22 that you don't want me to get  
 23 evidence that might hurt your  
 24 case, Paul, but I think that's my

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 537

1 addresses what we had just been talking  
 2 about, Mr. Prevoznik. It states, "In  
 3 February 2018, DEA launched a new tool in  
 4 its ARCOS online reporting system to  
 5 assist drug manufacturers and  
 6 distributors with their regulatory  
 7 obligations under the Controlled  
 8 Substances Act."  
 9 Do you see that?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. And that refers to your  
 12 idea, right?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. And that's where you are  
 15 giving a distributor the number of  
 16 distributors supplying to Customer A,  
 17 right?  
 18 A. Correct.  
 19 Q. Okay. If you look at the  
 20 third sentence in that paragraph, it  
 21 talks -- it says, "The enhancement will  
 22 allow a DEA-registered manufacturers and  
 23 distributors to view and download the  
 24 number of distributors and the amount,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 536

1 job.  
 2 And if I understand,  
 3 yesterday, the testimony from the  
 4 DEA is the DEA does their job, and  
 5 I'm not here to testify, but I am  
 6 here trying to do my job. I hope  
 7 you respect that. All right.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: We don't  
 9 have copies.  
 10 MR. STEPHENS: Yes, sir.  
 11 Yeah, we do.  
 12 (Document marked for  
 13 identification as Exhibit  
 14 DEA-Prevoznik-19.)  
 15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 16 Q. All right. Mr. Prevoznik,  
 17 I'm showing you what's been marked as  
 18 Exhibit Number 19, which is a DEA press  
 19 release dated February 26, 2019.  
 20 Do you see that?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. So in two-thousand -- if you  
 23 look at the fourth paragraph on the first  
 24 page, the very first sentence, I think

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 538

1 anonymized data, in both grams and dosage  
 2 units, each distributor sold to a  
 3 prospective customer in the last  
 4 available six months of data."  
 5 Correct?  
 6 A. Could I get another copy,  
 7 because the exhibit went off the bottom.  
 8 Cut off the last part of that sentence.  
 9 I just want to make sure.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You can  
 11 look at mine.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 13 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 14 Q. And the sentence that I just  
 15 read about providing the volumes, that's  
 16 the change that DEA made in 2019, right?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 18 Mischaracterizes.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 20 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 21 Q. Okay. And then if you look  
 22 at the last paragraph in this DEA press  
 23 release, it states, "Manufacturers and  
 24 distributors have consistently expressed

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 539

1 a desire for assistance from DEA in  
 2 fulfilling these obligations and have  
 3 requested ARCOS information to help them  
 4 make informed decisions about whether new  
 5 customers are purchasing excessive  
 6 quantities of controlled substances."  
 7 Do you see that?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. So DEA in 2019 understood  
 10 that manufacturers and distributors have  
 11 consistently expressed a desire for  
 12 assistance from DEA in fulfilling their  
 13 obligations, and as part of that,  
 14 requested ARCOS information from DEA,  
 15 right?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 17 Form.  
 18 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 19 Foundation.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Well, over the  
 21 years they've expressed this is  
 22 business strategy protected. So  
 23 we've done -- we've done that.  
 24 But once the new tool, the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 541

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 2 Mischaracterizes. Asked and  
 3 answered.  
 4 THE WITNESS: I think I just  
 5 answered it.  
 6 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 7 Q. Well, is this -- is this  
 8 press release accurate?  
 9 A. Well, yeah, because they --  
 10 because I said, after the first came out,  
 11 one of the complaints was -- that we've  
 12 heard a number of times, it's not -- it's  
 13 not enough.  
 14 Q. Are you --  
 15 A. So I'm just relaying what I  
 16 know from my -- my personal discussions  
 17 with some of the distributor registrants  
 18 that asked for that. So that was the  
 19 first time that I had heard that they  
 20 wanted that. So -- and then the Support  
 21 Act came in, and we were -- that was  
 22 something that we were told that we  
 23 needed to do, so -- statutorily, so...  
 24 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, do you view

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 540

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 542

1 first tool went out in 2018, we  
 2 had feedback from quite a few of  
 3 the distributors that said, hey,  
 4 this would be great if we could  
 5 get de-identified data. So that's  
 6 why we put it in there. We were  
 7 able to -- we felt comfortable  
 8 enough to put that out there,  
 9 because they had requested it at  
 10 that point.  
 11 They had -- to my knowledge,  
 12 they had not expressed that they  
 13 wanted that. When we had  
 14 mentioned it, they were always --  
 15 that's business data. Don't  
 16 provide it. So...  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. You would agree that  
 19 manufacturers and distributors have  
 20 consistently expressed a desire for  
 21 assistance from DEA in fulfilling these  
 22 obligations and have requested ARCOS  
 23 information to help them make informed  
 24 decisions, right?

1 this, sharing of more information with  
 2 industry, as an example of DEA's current  
 3 leadership taking additional steps to  
 4 collaborate with industry to help reduce  
 5 diversion?  
 6 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 7 Foundation.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 10 Q. And do you think that's a  
 11 good thing?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 15 Q. All right. Are you familiar  
 16 with an INNER JOIN process related to  
 17 database management for databases like  
 18 ARCOS?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 20 Hang on. Don't testify based on  
 21 law enforcement sensitive  
 22 information.  
 23 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 24 Scope.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 543

1 THE WITNESS: I don't know  
2 what an INNER JOIN --  
3 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
4 Q. Okay. An INNER JOIN process  
5 is a common SQL database concept that has  
6 been in existence for decades in a  
7 relational database management systems  
8 where you can anonymize data and provide  
9 data to people who are sending products  
10 to the same individuals by using an  
11 individual, like customer A here, by  
12 using their Tax ID number, their  
13 registration number or something along  
14 those lines.  
15 Is anybody at DEA familiar  
16 with INNER JOIN database management  
17 protocols from 2006 to 2015 that you're  
18 aware of?  
19 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
20 Scope, and the witness's  
21 competence on these issues.  
22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
23 Calls for speculation.  
24 Do you understand the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 545

1 you to take huge chunks of data, be able  
2 to pull it down, and summarize it or --  
3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Can you  
4 spell COGNOS?  
5 THE WITNESS: C-O-G-N-O-S, I  
6 believe. It's either N-O-S or  
7 N-U-S.  
8 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
9 Q. So COGNOS -- well, let me  
10 ask ARCOS first.  
11 Is ARCOS a system that DEA  
12 built, or is it a system that DEA  
13 purchased from a software vendor?  
14 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
15 Scope.  
16 THE WITNESS: It's my  
17 understanding it's a system that  
18 we built.  
19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
20 Q. Okay. So then, if DEA built  
21 it, then DEA is going to have the  
22 expertise inhouse to understand how it  
23 works, right?  
24 A. Correct.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 544

1 question?  
2 THE WITNESS: It sounds like  
3 it's a software -- it sounds like  
4 to me it's a software question.  
5 We do have competent people within  
6 DEA. I am not one of the ones who  
7 would claim competency for that.  
8 MR. FARRELL: Can you spell  
9 that, INNER JOIN?  
10 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, it's  
11 INNER JOIN, I-N-N-E-R, J-O-I-N.  
12 And if you look it up under SQL --  
13 SQL database management.  
14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
15 Q. All right. So you do have  
16 people on staff at DEA who are tasked  
17 with understanding ARCOS's capabilities  
18 and maximizing the efficiency of ARCOS,  
19 true?  
20 A. True.  
21 Q. And you had mentioned COGNOS  
22 yesterday. Can you explain to me again  
23 what COGNOS is?  
24 A. So COGNOS basically allows

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 546

1 Q. Okay. And how does COGNOS  
2 relate to ARCOS?  
3 A. COGNOS is a software that's  
4 used so that you can take the ARCOS data,  
5 huge quantities of ARCOS data, and be  
6 able to actually use it to do an analysis  
7 on it.  
8 Q. Okay. Is COGNOS software  
9 database or software system that DEA  
10 purchased from a vendor or did DEA create  
11 it?  
12 A. I believe it's a vendor.  
13 Q. It's a --  
14 A. I believe it's IBM.  
15 Q. Okay. IBM. A fine company,  
16 right?  
17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
18 MR. FARRELL: If you're  
19 representing IBM...  
20 MR. STEPHENS: All right.  
21 We'll stipulate to that. It's a  
22 fine company.  
23 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
24 Q. All right. But -- but so,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 547

1 you know, part of the function with --  
 2 with COGNOS and ARCOS is to understand  
 3 its capabilities. And if an INNER JOIN  
 4 process would have been beneficial to  
 5 reducing diversion, you would have hoped  
 6 that someone at DEA would have worked on  
 7 that, right?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 9 Calls for speculation.  
 10 Foundation.  
 11 You can answer if you  
 12 understand.  
 13 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I  
 14 understand. I mean, we've been  
 15 making improvements with -- with  
 16 the system since we started so...  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. But can you agree with me  
 19 that -- that the DEA would want to  
 20 maximize the efficiency of that ARCOS  
 21 database to do everything possible in the  
 22 DEA's powers to reduce diversion?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. And if using an INNER JOIN

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 549

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 2 Foundation, scope. Incomplete  
 3 hypothetical.  
 4 You can answer if you  
 5 understand.  
 6 THE WITNESS: I'm just  
 7 having a little bit -- because I  
 8 don't know what INNER JOIN is.  
 9 You can tell me it's a SQL. You  
 10 can tell me whatever. But is  
 11 it -- does it have to work off the  
 12 internet? Is it -- you know,  
 13 that's what I'm saying. I'm not  
 14 competent enough to -- to be  
 15 answering that question.  
 16 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 17 Q. Let me just ask a more  
 18 general question.  
 19 A. Sure.  
 20 Q. You would agree with me that  
 21 if people at DEA who are responsible for  
 22 managing the architecture of the ARCOS  
 23 database understood that there was a more  
 24 efficient way to use ARCOS by making a

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 548

1 process earlier would have been  
 2 beneficial to that effort, you would have  
 3 supported it, had you known about it?  
 4 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 5 Foundation.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 7 Foundation. Scope. Incomplete  
 8 hypothetical.  
 9 You can answer.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Me personally?  
 11 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 12 Q. Correct.  
 13 A. Well, I mean, I'm not in a  
 14 position to make a decision like that of  
 15 what software we're going to use.  
 16 That's -- that's an agency decision.  
 17 Q. Would you agree that if the  
 18 people at DEA who are responsible for  
 19 managing the architecture of this  
 20 database and its efficiency were aware of  
 21 an INNER JOIN process earlier and that  
 22 would have been beneficial to DEA's use  
 23 of ARCOS, DEA would have supported doing  
 24 that, right, using an INNER JOIN process?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 550

1 change, you would have supported them  
 2 making that change to make it more  
 3 efficient and effective, true?  
 4 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 6 Foundation. Incomplete  
 7 hypothetical.  
 8 You can answer.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 11 Q. Okay. I had asked you one  
 12 question a little bit earlier about  
 13 suspicious order reports. I would now  
 14 like to turn to that topic and ask you a  
 15 few questions about how and why DEA  
 16 analyzes suspicious order reports to  
 17 identify and stop sources of diversion.  
 18 Okay?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. This is Topic 9 of your  
 21 30(b)(6) designation.  
 22 Now, yesterday you had  
 23 mentioned, in reporting suspicious order  
 24 reports, you had said some come to

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 551

1 headquarters, and some go to the field,  
 2 right, if I understood what you said?  
 3 A. Yes. Per the reg, they are  
 4 supposed to go to the field. If they --  
 5 if we've had some sort of action against  
 6 a registrant, and we directed them to  
 7 send it to headquarters, those would send  
 8 it electronically.  
 9 Q. Okay. And yesterday you had  
 10 mentioned a "big three," right?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. Okay. Walmart is not one of  
 13 the big three, right?  
 14 A. No.  
 15 Q. And the other retail chain  
 16 pharmacies that we've talked about today,  
 17 they are not part of the big three,  
 18 right?  
 19 A. Well, just to clarify, we're  
 20 talking -- because we started with  
 21 distributors that you wanted to talk  
 22 about distributors of, you know, of your  
 23 chain stores. And then now you're  
 24 asking -- or you're -- are you talking

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 553

1 So when you said big three  
 2 yesterday, were you referring to Walmart  
 3 or not?  
 4 A. No.  
 5 Q. Okay. That -- that's all I  
 6 was asking, Mr. Prevoznik. I'm sorry.  
 7 A. Okay.  
 8 Q. Would you agree that a  
 9 suspicious order report presents DEA with  
 10 a possible investigative lead that could  
 11 result in DEA identifying someone who is  
 12 diverting controlled substances?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 14 answered.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 17 Q. If DEA investigates  
 18 suspicious order reports, DEA expects and  
 19 hopes that those investigations will lead  
 20 to a reduction in diversion, fair?  
 21 A. If -- if that's where it  
 22 leads to. Not every -- not every SORs  
 23 report is going to lead to diversion.  
 24 Q. Okay. But does DEA hope

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 552

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 554

1 the distributors of Walmart, or are you  
 2 talking the pharmacies of Walmart in  
 3 terms of this?  
 4 Q. No, no, no -- no, no, no.  
 5 I'm just trying to say, you had said the  
 6 big three sends stuff to headquarters,  
 7 right?  
 8 A. Right. Distributors.  
 9 Q. The big three distributors?  
 10 A. Right.  
 11 Q. And all I'm saying is -- is  
 12 that when you said big three, you weren't  
 13 referring to Walmart, right?  
 14 A. Well, I just want -- I just  
 15 want to clarify that we are talking about  
 16 the big three distributors, because  
 17 Walmart is a pretty big -- one of the  
 18 bigger chain pharmacies out there. So I  
 19 just want to make sure we're clear on  
 20 that.  
 21 Q. Right.  
 22 A. That's all. I'm just  
 23 clarifying that.  
 24 Q. Okay, okay. All right.

1 that investigations of SORs reports will  
 2 lead to a reduction in diversion?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. Has DEA identified sources  
 5 of diversion based on information it  
 6 received in suspicious order reports?  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Don't  
 8 testify based on ongoing  
 9 investigations or enforcement  
 10 activities.  
 11 You can answer.  
 12 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 13 Q. Just yes or no.  
 14 A. Could you repeat, please?  
 15 Q. Sure.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: No current  
 17 enforcement investigations, yes or  
 18 no question.  
 19 Do you want to repeat it?  
 20 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 21 Q. Yes, let -- let me repeat  
 22 the question. And I'm just asking for a  
 23 yes or no. This is a baseline question.  
 24 A. I know, but I have to listen

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 555

1 to my instruction too.  
2 Q. Understood.  
3 Has DEA identified sources  
4 of diversion based on information DEA has  
5 received in suspicious order reports?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. Okay. When DEA identifies a  
8 source of diversion via information in a  
9 suspicious order report, does DEA want to  
10 stop the supply of opioids to that source  
11 of diversion?  
12 A. Yes.  
13 Q. And does DEA want to stop  
14 the supply of opioids to that source of  
15 diversion as soon as DEA learns the  
16 identity of the suspected diverter?  
17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
20 Q. All right. Between 2007 and  
21 2018, DEA received over 1.2 million  
22 electronic suspicious order reports from  
23 registrants.  
24 A. Is that a -- it sounds like

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 557

1 Q. Okay. Question Number 25  
2 there on Page 93, Mr. Prevoznik. Are you  
3 with me?  
4 A. Yes.  
5 Q. It says, "How many  
6 suspicious order reports does DEA now  
7 receive from distributors annually?"  
8 Did I read that right?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. Okay. And the response, on  
11 the last sentence at the bottom of Page  
12 93 says, "DEA headquarters has received  
13 1,204,400 electronic suspicious order  
14 reports from 135 distinct registrants  
15 from 2007 to 2018."  
16 Do you see that?  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. Okay. Does that give you a  
19 little bit more precise number that DEA  
20 had on March 20th of 2018 when it was  
21 reporting back to Congress?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. Okay. All right. So I have  
24 a few questions for you about how DEA

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 556

1 it was a statement. I'm sorry.  
2 Q. It's a question. Is that  
3 true?  
4 A. Could you -- could you  
5 repeat the question.  
6 Q. Sure.  
7 Between 2007 and 2018 DEA  
8 received over 1.2 million electronic  
9 suspicious order reports from  
10 registrants, true?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. Let me -- if I could point  
13 you back to Exhibit 17, which is the  
14 transcript from March -- or the senate  
15 congressional record from March 20, 2018.  
16 Do you have that in front of  
17 you?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. I direct you to Page 93,  
20 Mr. Prevoznik.  
21 A. Okay.  
22 Q. And this is a Q&A, written  
23 Q&A between Congress and DEA, right?  
24 A. That's what it looks like.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 558

1 analyzes those SORs -- analyzed SORs  
2 between 2006 and 2015.  
3 Is it fair to say that DEA's  
4 current leadership has been working hard  
5 to improve how DEA reviews suspicious  
6 order reports?  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
9 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
10 a published policy that ensured that  
11 someone at DEA would investigate every  
12 suspicious order report that DEA  
13 received?  
14 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
15 Lack of foundation.  
16 THE WITNESS: Not that I'm  
17 aware of.  
18 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
19 Q. Okay. Was there any policy  
20 at DEA that would have prevented  
21 Mr. Rannazzisi, who ran the diversion  
22 control group, from instituting a  
23 practice or policy that ensured that  
24 someone from DEA would investigate every

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 559

1 suspicious order report that DEA  
 2 received?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection  
 4 to form.  
 5 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 6 Foundation.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 8 knowledge.  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: For the  
 10 record, I noticed the witness  
 11 reached to his binder which  
 12 contains DEA policies. Do you  
 13 want to reference that to refresh  
 14 your --  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yeah, could  
 16 I -- could I reference it?  
 17 MR. STEPHENS: That's fine.  
 18 Do you want to go off the record  
 19 and do that? Let's do that.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Well,  
 21 let's wait until there is a  
 22 question pending.  
 23 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. That's  
 24 fine. I just don't want to burn

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 561

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Hang on.  
 2 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 3 Scope.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 5 You can answer if you know.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 8 Q. Okay. Mr. Prevoznik, who is  
 9 the greatest law enforcement agency in  
 10 the world at investigating money  
 11 laundering investigations?  
 12 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 14 Scope. Calls for speculation.  
 15 You can answer.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Do I have to?  
 17 FBI.  
 18 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 19 Q. Oh, you think it's FBI.  
 20 Okay. Mr. Prevoznik, hold  
 21 on. Hold on. Hold on.  
 22 Mr. Prevoznik, you would  
 23 agree with me that the Drug Enforcement  
 24 Administration is one of the greatest law

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 560

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 562

1 my time on the clock. If you need  
 2 to review something, you want to  
 3 take a break to do it, I'm fine  
 4 with that, Mr. Prevoznik. Okay?  
 5 Just let me know.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: But you're  
 7 allowed to review it if you need  
 8 to to answer his question.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Right. Thank  
 10 you.  
 11 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 12 Q. Yeah. Are we good?  
 13 A. Yeah.  
 14 Q. Okay. All right. Have you  
 15 ever heard of a suspicious activity  
 16 report known as a SAR?  
 17 A. No. That doesn't --  
 18 Q. Are you aware in banking  
 19 circles that banks report SARs --  
 20 A. Yeah.  
 21 Q. -- suspicious activity  
 22 reports, related to suspect transactions  
 23 that they see traveling through their  
 24 banks?

1 enforcement agencies on the planet  
 2 investigating money laundering  
 3 investigations, correct?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 5 Scope.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, correct.  
 7 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 8 Q. Okay. And DEA, through  
 9 OCDETF, the Organized Crime Drug  
 10 Enforcement Task Force, participates with  
 11 other agencies, like your colleagues at  
 12 the FBI, like your colleagues at the IRS,  
 13 to do the most sophisticated money  
 14 laundering investigations in the world,  
 15 right?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 18 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 19 Q. All right. Now, in  
 20 conducting those money laundering  
 21 investigations, it's common for the  
 22 United States government, including DEA,  
 23 to work on SAR review committees to  
 24 review SARs to advance the money

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 563

1 laundering investigations that they're --  
 2 that they're working on through banking  
 3 institutions, right?  
 4 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 5 Scope.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: We're well  
 7 outside the scope.  
 8 MS. SINGER: This is so far  
 9 beyond.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You can  
 11 answer if you know.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Yeah -- yes.  
 13 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 14 Q. Okay. Between 2006 and  
 15 2015, under the leadership of  
 16 Mr. Rannazzisi, did DEA headquarters have  
 17 a procedure by which it formed a SORs  
 18 review committee, a suspicious order  
 19 review committee, at DEA headquarters to  
 20 analyze all of the SORs received by DEA  
 21 from registrants?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 23 MS. SINGER: Lack of  
 24 foundation.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 565

1 investigation by DEA?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 3 Foundation. Vague.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 5 knowledge.  
 6 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 7 Q. Was there any policy at DEA  
 8 that would have prevented Mr. Rannazzisi  
 9 from forming a SORs review committee at  
 10 DEA headquarters to analyze all of the  
 11 SORs, the suspicious order reports,  
 12 received by DEA from registrants between  
 13 2006 and 2015?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 16 knowledge.  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 19 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA have  
 20 any field division institute a SORs  
 21 review committee to analyze suspicious  
 22 order reports received from registrants  
 23 in that field division?  
 24 A. Not -- no, not for those

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 564

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 566

1 THE WITNESS: No. We still  
 2 haven't, and you have the SORs  
 3 that go to the field, as well as  
 4 the SORs electronically, so...  
 5 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 6 Q. Okay. Is there any central  
 7 body anywhere within DEA that's organized  
 8 and formed to review SORs, to have a  
 9 central point of contact to determine  
 10 whether a particular SOR would be really  
 11 good for an investigation for DEA to  
 12 pursue?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague as  
 14 to time. Vague.  
 15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 16 Q. Let me restate it.  
 17 Between 2006 and 2015, under  
 18 the leadership of Mr. Rannazzisi, was  
 19 there any central body anywhere within  
 20 DEA organized and formed to review  
 21 suspicious order reports so that DEA  
 22 would have a central point of contact to  
 23 determine whether a particular suspicious  
 24 order report should be pursued for an

1 that received. But we were doing  
 2 investigations and analysis on those that  
 3 we never received.  
 4 Q. Okay. So my question is a  
 5 little bit different. Let me reframe it.  
 6 I think I understand your answer.  
 7 Between 2006 and 2015, under  
 8 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did any DEA  
 9 field division form a SORs review  
 10 committee to analyze all SORs, suspicious  
 11 order reports, received from registrants  
 12 in that jurisdiction?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 15 knowledge.  
 16 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 17 Q. Okay. Was there any policy  
 18 at DEA between 2006 and 2015, that would  
 19 have prevented Mr. Rannazzisi from  
 20 instituting a procedure by which field  
 21 divisions were required to form a  
 22 suspicious order review committee to  
 23 analyze all of the suspicious order  
 24 reports received within that field

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 567

1 division?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 4 knowledge.  
 5 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 6 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 7 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA  
 8 headquarters institute any policy whereby  
 9 DEA field divisions were required to  
 10 DEA -- to update DEA headquarters  
 11 regarding what, if anything, the field  
 12 division had done to investigate inbound  
 13 suspicious order reports?  
 14 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 15 Foundation.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 17 please repeat that?  
 18 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 19 Q. Sure.  
 20 Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 21 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA  
 22 headquarters institute any policy whereby  
 23 DEA field divisions were required to  
 24 update DEA headquarters regarding what,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 569

1 suspicious order reports were  
 2 investigated by the field divisions?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 4 answered.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 6 knowledge.  
 7 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 8 Q. Was there any policy at DEA  
 9 that would have prevented Mr. Rannazzisi  
 10 and the diversion control group from  
 11 instituting a practice that required the  
 12 field division to update headquarters  
 13 regarding the percentage of SORs reports  
 14 that the field division had investigated?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 16 MS. SINGER: Continuing  
 17 objection to this. Lack of  
 18 foundation.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 20 answered.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 22 knowledge.  
 23 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 24 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 568

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 570

1 if anything, the field division had done  
 2 to investigate inbound suspicious order  
 3 reports the field division had received  
 4 from registrants?  
 5 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 6 Q. Was there any policy at DEA  
 7 between 2006 and 2015 that would have  
 8 prevented Mr. Rannazzisi from instituting  
 9 a practice that required the field  
 10 divisions to update headquarters about  
 11 what the field division had done to  
 12 investigate inbound suspicious order  
 13 reports?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 15 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 16 Foundation.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 18 knowledge.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. Between 2006 and 2015 under  
 21 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership did DEA have  
 22 any process that would have allowed the  
 23 diversion control group at DEA  
 24 headquarters to know what percentage of

1 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, did DEA  
 2 headquarters have any procedure whereby  
 3 someone at DEA input the suspicious order  
 4 reports into any DEA central database for  
 5 tracking purposes?  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 7 Foundation.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Could -- we  
 9 don't input. We don't input it,  
 10 the registrants -- if it's going  
 11 in electronically, the registrant  
 12 sends it in via electronic. We  
 13 don't input.  
 14 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 15 Q. Okay. I gotcha.  
 16 Between 2007 and 2015 under  
 17 Mr. Rannazzisi's leadership, what  
 18 percentage of suspicious order reports  
 19 did DEA convert into immediate suspension  
 20 orders?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 22 answered.  
 23 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
 24 BY MR. STEPHENS:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 571

1 Q. Okay.  
2 (Document marked for  
3 identification as Exhibit  
4 DEA-Prevoznik-20.)  
5 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
6 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, I'm showing  
7 you what has been marked as DEA  
8 exhibit -- or I'm sorry. What has been  
9 marked as Exhibit Number 20.  
10 Do you have it in front of  
11 you?  
12 A. Yes, I have it. Yes.  
13 Q. Okay. And this is a hearing  
14 transcript from January 25, 2018, related  
15 to "Combatting the Opioid Crisis:  
16 Exploiting Vulnerabilities in  
17 International Mail," before the permanent  
18 subcommittee on investigations.  
19 Do you see that?  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. Okay. And I would direct  
22 you to Page 275.  
23 A. That's the top number?  
24 Q. Yeah, at the top.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 573

1 Administration at headquarters was  
2 reviewing suspicious order reports, if  
3 anybody?  
4 A. What time, time period?  
5 Q. Say 2018.  
6 A. So the field had -- the  
7 field has access to it, so the field  
8 would review them.  
9 Q. Okay.  
10 A. That's part of their duties,  
11 is to review it.  
12 Q. Okay. Between 2006 and  
13 2015, was anyone at DEA headquarters  
14 reviewing suspicious order reports or was  
15 it all done in the field?  
16 A. It was done in the field,  
17 and I believe it was done at headquarters  
18 as well. It would be with Kyle Wright  
19 when he was in charge of the unit.  
20 Q. Okay. Anybody else at  
21 headquarters?  
22 A. Not that I'm aware of.  
23 Q. Okay. So it would have been  
24 Mr. Wright and Mr. Wright's team or

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 572

1 All right. And -- so let me  
2 also direct you to Page 269 which is the  
3 second page of this exhibit. Just to set  
4 the context, Mr. Prevoznik.  
5 A. Okay.  
6 Q. So on -- on 269, these are  
7 questions for the record, Drug  
8 Enforcement Administration before the  
9 permanent subcommittee on investigations  
10 on January 25, 2018, right?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. And it's -- it's common for  
13 DEA to receive written questions from  
14 Congress and then provide written  
15 responses, right?  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. Okay. And then if you look  
18 at Page 275, there's a question and an  
19 answer. Do you see that?  
20 A. I'm getting there, yep.  
21 Q. Okay. And before we get  
22 there, let me ask you one follow-up  
23 question.  
24 Who at the Drug Enforcement

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 574

1 squad, right?  
2 A. Correct.  
3 Q. Okay. Now, turning back to  
4 Exhibit Number 20.  
5 The -- you'll see that  
6 the -- the question is -- well, the --  
7 the question states: "The argument has  
8 been made in the Washington Post and  
9 elsewhere that enforcement efforts at DEA  
10 slowed down long before the 2016 law,"  
11 right?  
12 Do you see that?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. Okay. And in response, part  
15 of the response, "DEA provides actions  
16 leading to registration revocation  
17 statistics."  
18 Do you see that?  
19 A. Did you read that from  
20 somewhere or?  
21 Q. So I'm just looking at  
22 the -- at the top of the chart right  
23 here, Mr. Prevoznik.  
24 A. Oh okay. All right. Yeah,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 575

1 I just wanted --  
 2 Q. Yeah, sure.  
 3 A. I wasn't sure exactly where  
 4 you were. Go ahead.  
 5 Q. So DEA provided to Congress  
 6 a chart of statistics in this response,  
 7 right?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. And the chart reflects the  
 10 actions leading to registration  
 11 revocation for fiscal year 2007 to 2017,  
 12 right?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. And the government's fiscal  
 15 year runs from October 1st to  
 16 September 30th, right?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. All right. If you look, the  
 19 question that I had asked before we went  
 20 to this chart was whether you knew the  
 21 percentage of suspicious order reports  
 22 that DEA converted into immediate  
 23 suspension orders, right?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 577

1 to show cause, and perhaps they  
 2 got suspended. There was some  
 3 administrative action because they  
 4 did not report them.  
 5 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 6 Q. All right. But my point,  
 7 Mr. Prevoznik, is simply that the 254  
 8 immediate suspension orders that are  
 9 listed here between 2007 and 2017, not  
 10 every one of them was the result of DEA  
 11 following up on a suspicious order report  
 12 that had been sent to DEA; is that fair?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Are you  
 14 representing to the witness that  
 15 these numbers add up to 254?  
 16 MR. STEPHENS: Yes.  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. I will represent to you that  
 19 for the immediate suspension orders, the  
 20 totals from 2007 to 2017, is 254. I will  
 21 represent to you that the order to show  
 22 cause filed from 2007 to 2017 is 638.  
 23 And I'll also represent to you that the  
 24 total column from 2007 to 2017 is 9,851.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 576

1 answered.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 4 Q. Okay. Now, you would agree  
 5 with me, wouldn't you, that in the  
 6 suspension orders that are identified  
 7 here from 2007 to 2017, not all of those  
 8 were the result of DEA following up on a  
 9 suspicious order report; is that fair?  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 11 speculation.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Well, I mean  
 13 some of them were because they  
 14 weren't being filed, so...  
 15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 16 Q. Okay.  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You can  
 18 finish your answer.  
 19 THE WITNESS: So they  
 20 would -- it was registrants that  
 21 had not filed. So there was  
 22 action taken against those that  
 23 did not file. So it would be  
 24 either -- fall under an ISO, order

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 578

1 Okay?  
 2 A. Okay.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Counsel is  
 4 telling you that.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Okay.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: We haven't  
 7 checked his math.  
 8 MR. STEPHENS: You're  
 9 welcome to do so.  
 10 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 11 Q. So my question,  
 12 Mr. Prevoznik, was, would you agree with  
 13 me that the 254 suspension orders that  
 14 are listed here from 2007 to 2017, not  
 15 every one of them was generated as the  
 16 result of DEA following up on an  
 17 investigation of a SOR report the DEA had  
 18 received; is that fair?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 20 answered.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 23 Q. Okay. For today's purposes,  
 24 let's assume that every one of these 254

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 579

1 was generated by the -- were all the  
 2 result of DEA receiving and investigating  
 3 a suspicious order report. All right.  
 4 I'll give you the benefit of that, okay?  
 5 A. Okay.  
 6 Q. If you take 254 against the  
 7 one point -- against the 1,204,400 SORs  
 8 reports the DEA received, that would  
 9 equate to something along the lines of  
 10 2/100 of 1 percent. Do you agree with  
 11 that?  
 12 A. I didn't do the math, but  
 13 I'll go with -- I'll go with you.  
 14 Q. Okay. So would you agree  
 15 the DEA would have obtained less than  
 16 1 percent of immediate suspension orders  
 17 off the 1.2 million suspicious order  
 18 reports that DEA received?  
 19 MR. FARRELL: Objection.  
 20 Foundation. And I think you just  
 21 bait and switched here a little  
 22 bit.  
 23 MR. STEPHENS: I didn't mean  
 24 to. So let me check my question.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 581

1 regarding that.  
 2 I mean, it's a hypothetical.  
 3 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 4 Q. Between 2007 and 2017, the  
 5 percentage of suspicious order reports  
 6 the DEA received and converted into  
 7 immediate suspension orders is less than  
 8 1 percent, true?  
 9 A. Yes. In your hypothetical,  
 10 true.  
 11 Q. All right. So between 2007  
 12 and 2017, the percentage of suspicious  
 13 order reports that DEA converted into  
 14 orders to show cause, the 638 here,  
 15 that's also less than 1 percent. It is  
 16 .005 or 5/100 of 1 percent?  
 17 MR. FARRELL: Objection.  
 18 Foundation.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 20 Foundation. Misstates prior  
 21 testimony.  
 22 THE WITNESS: It's a  
 23 hypothetical. I'll go with you.  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 580

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 582

1 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 2 Q. So my question is this:  
 3 Assuming that all 254 of the immediate  
 4 suspension orders that DEA received from  
 5 2007 to 2017 were based off of suspicious  
 6 order reports, and DEA received  
 7 1.2 million suspicious order reports, you  
 8 would agree with me that the percentage  
 9 of suspicious order reports that DEA  
 10 converted into immediate suspension  
 11 orders was less than 1 percent?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 13 Foundation. Misstates prior  
 14 testimony.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Well, I mean,  
 16 I think that's a unique way to  
 17 look at it. You can also do the  
 18 flip side and say how many weren't  
 19 reported that we had cases on.  
 20 And to just limit it to the ISOs  
 21 doesn't take you to putting people  
 22 in compliance, whether through  
 23 letters of admonition or MOAs that  
 24 we've come to with companies

1 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 2 Q. Okay. Between 2007 and  
 3 2017, if you include everything in the  
 4 table, orders to show cause, immediate  
 5 suspension orders filed, voluntary  
 6 surrenders, the 9,851 totaled from 2007  
 7 and 2017, the percentage of those against  
 8 the 1.2 million of suspicious order  
 9 reports would result in a conversion rate  
 10 of less than 1 percent?  
 11 MR. FARRELL: Objection.  
 12 Fuzzy math.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Which rule  
 14 is that?  
 15 Foundation. Misstates prior  
 16 testimony.  
 17 You can answer if you  
 18 understand.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. Let me ask you a more  
 21 precise question.  
 22 A. All right.  
 23 Q. Okay. What I want you to  
 24 do, is I'm going to ask about the 9,851,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 583

1 the full total, okay. Are you with me?  
2 A. I'm with you.  
3 Q. Okay. So between 2007 and  
4 2017, if you include the voluntary  
5 surrenders, immediate suspension orders,  
6 the order to show causes, the percentage  
7 of suspicious order reports that DEA  
8 converted of the suspicious order reports  
9 is less than 1 percent?  
10 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
11 Foundation. Misstates prior  
12 testimony.  
13 THE WITNESS: In your  
14 hypothetical situation, yes.  
15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
16 Q. Okay. Do you know what  
17 percentage of suspicious order reports  
18 DEA converted into criminal indictments  
19 between 2007 and 2017?  
20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
21 THE WITNESS: I do not.  
22 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
23 Q. Do you know -- okay. So  
24 between 2007 and 2017, would you know

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 585

1 from suspicious order reports like it  
2 does in its OCDETF reporting where it  
3 identifies investigations initiated,  
4 indictments returned, convictions  
5 obtained?  
6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
7 speculation.  
8 And I instruct you not to  
9 answer based on internal  
10 deliberative communications.  
11 THE WITNESS: We do have  
12 those statistics for that. But  
13 not based off of a SOR lead or an  
14 ARCOS lead. Those are just  
15 pointers. There's various other  
16 factors get into what a case --  
17 how a case started, where it went,  
18 and what its final disposition  
19 was.  
20 (Document marked for  
21 identification as Exhibit  
22 DEA-Prevoznik-21.)  
23 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
24 Q. Okay. Mr. Prevoznik, I'm

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 584

1 what percentage of suspicious order  
2 reports DEA converted into criminal  
3 convictions?  
4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
5 THE WITNESS: I do not.  
6 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
7 Q. Does DEA keep those kind of  
8 statistics?  
9 A. No, we don't.  
10 Q. Okay. You're aware that DEA  
11 keeps those kind of statistics,  
12 investigations initiated, indictments  
13 returned, convictions obtained on all of  
14 their OCDETF cases and reports them. Are  
15 you aware of that?  
16 A. Correct, yes.  
17 Q. Okay.  
18 A. I thought you were asking  
19 specific to suspicious order reports.  
20 Q. I absolutely was.  
21 Is there a reason why DEA  
22 does not report the number of indictments  
23 returned, investigations initiated, and  
24 convictions obtained based on information

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 586

1 showing you what's been marked as Exhibit  
2 Number 21.  
3 MR. STEPHENS: I'm sorry,  
4 Counsel.  
5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: We're  
6 going to attempt to claw 21 back  
7 too.  
8 MR. STEPHENS: Basis?  
9 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
10 Deliberative process.  
11 Attorney/client. 21 is an e-mail  
12 attaching, I can't remember what  
13 exhibit number, but we previously  
14 notified you that we were going to  
15 clawback.  
16 MR. STEPHENS: This one?  
17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Yes.  
18 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. I sent  
19 this one in -- to counsel on  
20 Monday with a stack of potential  
21 exhibits and didn't hear anything  
22 back.  
23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And we're  
24 telling you, as we told you

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 587

1 yesterday, that we're attempting  
 2 to claw it back.  
 3 If you ask the witness  
 4 questions I'll instruct him not to  
 5 answer.  
 6 MR. BENNETT: Okay. And --  
 7 and for the record, you did send  
 8 that to me. I was never able to  
 9 access it and open it. So I never  
 10 reviewed your documents. They  
 11 didn't come through.  
 12 MR. STEPHENS: All right.  
 13 So I didn't hear that back --  
 14 MR. BENNETT: Well, and I  
 15 was traveling, so -- yeah, you're  
 16 right --  
 17 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. But  
 18 again for the record --  
 19 MR. BENNETT: But I never  
 20 looked at them.  
 21 MR. STEPHENS: That's fine.  
 22 For the record, James, I  
 23 sent it to everybody on the DEA  
 24 team. Okay?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 589

1 five minutes.  
 2 MR. FARRELL: And then after  
 3 that, what do you think?  
 4 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, I'll  
 5 need to confer with my colleagues.  
 6 MR. FARRELL: Oh, so you're  
 7 getting close?  
 8 MR. STEPHENS: Yes.  
 9 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 10 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, in enforcing  
 11 the Controlled Substances Act does DEA  
 12 believe that every individual is entitled  
 13 to due process in every investigation  
 14 that DEA conducts to enforce the  
 15 Controlled Substances Act?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 17 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 18 You can answer.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 21 Q. Does DEA believe that the  
 22 DEA must assess the facts as to each  
 23 individual actor separately to determine  
 24 whether an individual has violated the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 588

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 590

1 Everyone who is counsel here  
 2 today, all four of you received  
 3 that from me.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And you  
 5 have our answer.  
 6 MR. FARRELL: Okay. So just  
 7 to be clear, am I allowed to read  
 8 this or not allowed to read this?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: We're  
 10 attempting to claw it back.  
 11 MR. STEPHENS: And -- and  
 12 for the record, let me apologize.  
 13 If this was used yesterday, I am  
 14 down at the end of the table, I  
 15 didn't get a copy of it. So I --  
 16 I wasn't aware -- I reserve, as my  
 17 colleague reserves, our position  
 18 on this document.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. Mr. Prevoznik?  
 21 MR. FARRELL: Not to be  
 22 rude, but is there an expected  
 23 break time soon?  
 24 MR. STEPHENS: Yeah, like

1 Controlled Substances Act?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. DEA would not take the  
 4 actions of a few bad actors and seek to  
 5 indict everyone who might live in the  
 6 same neighborhood as those bad actors,  
 7 fair?  
 8 A. Correct.  
 9 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 10 Scope.  
 11 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 12 Q. You'd agree that simply  
 13 being close in proximity to a bad actor  
 14 does not mean that an individual has done  
 15 anything wrong, right?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 17 You can answer.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 19 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 20 Q. For example, if someone  
 21 overdoses on Colombian cocaine in  
 22 Cleveland, would DEA arrest every  
 23 Colombian native who leaves in Cleveland  
 24 and charge them for causing that

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 591

1 overdose?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 3 Incomplete hypothetical.  
 4 MR. FARRELL: This has a  
 5 traumatic impact upon like the  
 6 Colombian nationality, so you have  
 7 to be careful here.  
 8 MR. STEPHENS: Trust me. I  
 9 always was.  
 10 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 11 Q. Can you answer the question?  
 12 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 13 Q. You'd agree that DEA needs  
 14 individualized proof to establish exactly  
 15 who caused that overdose death before  
 16 deciding to charge anyone with a crime,  
 17 right?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Hang on.  
 19 Incomplete hypothetical. Scope.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat  
 21 it?  
 22 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 23 Q. You would agree the DEA  
 24 needs individualized proof to establish

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 593

1 Q. You would agree that due  
 2 process principles that existed in our  
 3 legal system for generations demand that  
 4 DEA not haul innocent actors into court  
 5 to answer for the actors for a few bad  
 6 actions?  
 7 MS. SINGER: Scope. And  
 8 calls for a legal analysis and  
 9 conclusion.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 11 Calls for a legal conclusion. And  
 12 based on your representation that  
 13 it will be about five minutes, I'm  
 14 going to let the witness answer.  
 15 MR. STEPHENS: Two minutes.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. And DEA agrees that those  
 19 due process principles still protect  
 20 innocent actors even when the legal issue  
 21 involves something as tragic as a heroin  
 22 overdose, right?  
 23 MS. SINGER: Continuing  
 24 objection.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 592

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 594

1 exactly who caused that overdose death  
 2 before deciding to charge anyone with a  
 3 crime?  
 4 MS. SINGER: Objection.  
 5 Scope.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 8 Q. Okay. And to counsel's  
 9 point, it might be a mistake for DEA to  
 10 assume it was a Colombian native who sold  
 11 the cocaine to the victim, right?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 13 hypothetical. Vague.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 16 Q. Okay. And it's important  
 17 not to bring any potential bias in  
 18 analyzing evidence because it could cloud  
 19 the judgment of the investigator, right?  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 21 Incomplete hypothetical.  
 22 MS. SINGER: Scope.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 BY MR. STEPHENS:

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 2 a legal conclusion. You can  
 3 answer.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 5 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 6 Q. Does DEA believe that the  
 7 same due process principles that require  
 8 individualized proof also apply to the  
 9 diversion investigations DEA conducts to  
 10 enforce the provisions of the Controlled  
 11 Substances Act?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 13 a legal conclusion. You can  
 14 answer.  
 15 THE WITNESS: I was waiting  
 16 to see -- correct.  
 17 BY MR. STEPHENS:  
 18 Q. And you would agree that  
 19 every manufacturer, distributor, and  
 20 retail chain pharmacy is entitled to  
 21 individualized review of its own conduct  
 22 before being accused for potential  
 23 violations of the Controlled Substances  
 24 Act committed by someone else?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 595

1 A. Correct.  
2 Q. For example, you'd agree  
3 that DEA should not accuse a retail chain  
4 pharmacy of diversion committed by a  
5 rogue internet pharmacy where there is no  
6 evidence showing any connection between  
7 the retail chain pharmacy and -- and the  
8 rogue internet pharmacy?  
9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
10 hypothetical.  
11 MR. STEPHENS: I'll withdraw  
12 the question.  
13 All right. Let me take a  
14 break.  
15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The  
16 parties agree?  
17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Yes.  
18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 10:57.  
19 We are off the video record.  
20 (Short break.)  
21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 11:34, we  
22 are on the video record.  
23 MR. STEPHENS: I think I'm  
24 at the end of my questions. I do

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 597

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you.  
2 - - -  
3 EXAMINATION  
4 - - -  
5 BY MR. FARRELL:  
6 Q. Will you state your name,  
7 rank, and title?  
8 A. Thomas Prevoznik. I am the  
9 acting section chief of pharmaceutical  
10 investigations for the DEA's diversion  
11 control division.  
12 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, my name is  
13 Paul Farrell, and I am one of the lawyers  
14 representing the plaintiffs. And so I  
15 thank you for coming here today. And I  
16 just wanted to set for the record, we  
17 sent a list of subject matters to the  
18 United States Drug Enforcement Agency and  
19 asked for somebody to be designated to  
20 testify on its behalf.  
21 You understand that the  
22 questions that I ask you today are not in  
23 your individual capacity, but we're  
24 asking for answers as if it was coming

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 596

1 have one question for you though,  
2 David, and it's to make sure that  
3 I understand your complete basis  
4 for clawing back the document  
5 which is the -- I think it was  
6 marked Number 12. It's the  
7 June 3rd, 2017, communication  
8 between Mr. Patterson and  
9 Mr. Rosenberg that includes a  
10 communication from AUSA and Leslie  
11 Wizner from Detroit.  
12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Correct,  
13 the basis for the clawback request  
14 was that this document is  
15 deliberative process, intra-DOJ  
16 discussions regarding improvements  
17 and enforcement protocols under  
18 the Controlled Substances Act and  
19 also attorney/client privilege.  
20 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you.  
21 And at this point we'll pass the  
22 witness.  
23 Thank you for your time,  
24 Mr. Prevoznik.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 598

1 from the DEA itself.  
2 A. Correct.  
3 Q. So the million-dollar  
4 question right out of the gate is, why  
5 didn't the DEA do more?  
6 So what I want to do is, I  
7 have the testimony from the former acting  
8 administrator, Robert Patterson. And I'm  
9 going to show you a video clip and then  
10 ask some follow-up questions. Okay?  
11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
12 THE WITNESS: Okay.  
13 MR. FARRELL: 523.  
14 BY MR. FARRELL:  
15 Q. This is Mr. Patterson's  
16 opening statement I believe his testimony  
17 before Congress on March 20, 2018, in  
18 front of the subcommittee on oversight  
19 and investigations, the committee on  
20 Energy and Commerce.  
21 You're aware that  
22 Mr. Patterson testified?  
23 A. Yes.  
24 Q. And he testified on behalf

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 599

1 of the DEA?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. To Congress under oath?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 MR. FARRELL: Show the first  
 6 clip, please.  
 7 (Video clip played as  
 8 follows:)  
 9 MR. PATTERSON: Where  
 10 license revocation is not  
 11 necessary, we've aggressively  
 12 pursued civil actions and MOUs  
 13 designed to ensure compliance.  
 14 Over the last decade, DEA has  
 15 levied fines totalling nearly  
 16 \$390 million against opioid  
 17 distributors nationwide and  
 18 entered into MOUs with each.  
 19 (Video concluded.)  
 20 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 21 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, can you  
 22 verify the accuracy of that statement?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. So the DEA has in fact

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 601

1 this trial, the jury has heard probably  
 2 several times, is the Energy and  
 3 Commerce's report following the testimony  
 4 of Mr. Patterson as well as the testimony  
 5 from numerous others.  
 6 Are you familiar with this  
 7 report?  
 8 A. Yes, I am.  
 9 Q. And this is on one  
 10 particular page, one of the findings and  
 11 the markings up are the lawyers, not from  
 12 Congress. You'll see where I put the  
 13 Star. And it basically says, "Had  
 14 HDA" -- "Had DEA more proactively used  
 15 ARCOS data, it could have discovered, in  
 16 a period of time at a place called  
 17 Sav-Rite Pharmacy Number 1 that there  
 18 were a lot of pills that were shipped."  
 19 Are you familiar with this  
 20 finding from Congress?  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. So when you and I walk

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 600

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 602

1 attempted to impose civil penalties and  
 2 conducted investigations into opioid  
 3 distribution and diversion?  
 4 A. Correct.  
 5 Q. I'm going to go to the next  
 6 clip. This is where the follow-up really  
 7 begins.  
 8 (Video clip played as  
 9 follows:)  
 10 MR. PATTERSON:  
 11 Administrative actions, civil  
 12 fines, and criminal cases are all  
 13 important steps. Where we have  
 14 fallen short in the past, it is by  
 15 not proactively leveraging the  
 16 data that has been available to  
 17 us.  
 18 (Video concluded.)  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, are you  
 21 familiar with that complaint?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. I'm also going to show you  
 24 what has been previously referenced in

1 through the ARCOS data, what we're  
 2 talking about is this dataset of  
 3 information that you had, correct?  
 4 A. Correct.  
 5 Q. And these are transactions  
 6 between manufacturers and distributors,  
 7 between distributors and pharmacies, that  
 8 are stored in a large database maintained  
 9 by the DEA?  
 10 A. Correct.  
 11 Q. Okay. So what -- what does  
 12 it mean when the DEA's position is that  
 13 you are not proactively using the ARCOS  
 14 data during this time frame?  
 15 A. Well, back during that time  
 16 frame, we were on what we called the  
 17 mainframe. So the process was slower of  
 18 ARCOS data, so when it would be uploaded  
 19 and processed. And so we were months  
 20 behind on getting that data up into the  
 21 system.  
 22 It was -- we were restricted  
 23 to a million transactions of upload per  
 24 night. And we received millions of

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 603

1 transactions. So that took a while.  
 2 In addition to that, you  
 3 also had, when they uploaded, there would  
 4 be errors, the most typical errors would  
 5 be wrong NDC code, wrong DEA number, or  
 6 the wrong DEA 222 order form number.  
 7 Q. It's my understanding that  
 8 today these transactions are stored  
 9 digitally with the DEA ARCOS database; is  
 10 that correct?  
 11 A. Correct.  
 12 Q. And now we are able to  
 13 presently and retrospectively look back  
 14 and figure out what happened. Is that  
 15 fair?  
 16 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 18 MR. STEPHENS: Objection.  
 19 MR. O'CONNOR: Object to  
 20 form.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 23 Q. Okay. Now, this may be a  
 24 terrible analogy, but my mind, what I'm

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 605

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 2 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. So going back and looking  
 4 backwards from this very same energy and  
 5 commerce report, I happened to be  
 6 familiar with it because of the West --  
 7 because of West Virginia. The Sav-Rite  
 8 Pharmacy from Page 125, Congress went  
 9 back and looked at the old ARCOS data.  
 10 And from it, what it's determined was  
 11 that McKesson Corporation -- are you  
 12 familiar with the company called  
 13 McKesson?  
 14 A. Yes, I am.  
 15 Q. And who are they?  
 16 A. They are a wholesaler,  
 17 distributor.  
 18 Q. McKesson Corporation sold  
 19 five million doses in 2006 and 2007 of  
 20 opium pills to a pharmacy in Kermit, West  
 21 Virginia. Can you, by looking at this  
 22 exhibit, tell me how many people,  
 23 according to Congress, live in Kermit,  
 24 West Virginia?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 604

1 thinking is, just like -- let's say if  
 2 the NSA keeps a log of everybody's cell  
 3 phone calls in the country, they're not  
 4 actively listening to everyone's call,  
 5 but they have the ability to go backwards  
 6 and piece together what happened. Is  
 7 that similar to what the DEA was doing  
 8 with ARCOS?  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 10 MR. STEPHENS: Objection.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 13 Q. Same thing with the SEC.  
 14 There are billions of trades that happen  
 15 on Wall Street, but the SEC isn't  
 16 necessarily the clearinghouse for these  
 17 trades, but it has the capacity to look  
 18 on a computer backwards and figure out  
 19 what happened if somebody broke the law.  
 20 Is that akin to what is going on with the  
 21 DEA and ARCOS during this time frame?  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 23 form.  
 24 MR. STEPHENS: Objection.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 606

1 MR. STEPHENS: Objection to  
 2 form and scope.  
 3 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 5 Foundation.  
 6 THE WITNESS: 406.  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. All right. So under any  
 9 reasonable -- is there any possibly way  
 10 that a town of 406 has a medical need for  
 11 over five million pills of opium in a  
 12 span of two years?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 14 Foundation. Calls for  
 15 speculation. Scope.  
 16 MR. STEPHENS: Scope as  
 17 well.  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'll join  
 19 the scope objection.  
 20 You can answer if you  
 21 understand.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 23 repeat it, please, one more time?  
 24 BY MR. FARRELL:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 607

1 Q. Yeah. Is there any basis  
 2 that you can make up in reality or  
 3 otherwise where a town of 400 people have  
 4 a medical need for five million pills of  
 5 opium in a span of 24 months?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 7 Form. Foundation. Scope. Calls  
 8 for speculation.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 10 There isn't. There isn't.  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. There is absolutely no way,  
 13 is there?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Same  
 15 objections.  
 16 THE WITNESS: No.  
 17 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 18 Q. So while some people may ask  
 19 the DEA why you didn't catch this, my  
 20 question to the DEA is why didn't you  
 21 indict McKesson?  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 23 form --  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm going

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 609

1 I -- I think that started  
 2 the problem, quite frankly, and a  
 3 lot of the frustration came from  
 4 chasing down the registrants and  
 5 ultimately reminding them of their  
 6 responsibility in this regulated  
 7 area.  
 8 (Video concluded.)  
 9 MR. FARRELL: So I'm going to  
 10 strike that and we're going to  
 11 start over, because I didn't lay a  
 12 proper foundation for that part.  
 13 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 14 Q. Beyond the opening statement  
 15 from the DEA to Congress through  
 16 Mr. Patterson here, there were also  
 17 questions and answers.  
 18 So one of the questions  
 19 Congress asked the DEA was: Why did the  
 20 DEA communications with industry fail to  
 21 prevent the kinds of major breakdowns  
 22 apparent in West Virginia?  
 23 I'm going to play for you  
 24 Mr. Patterson's response.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 608

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 610

1 to instruct you not to answer  
 2 that.  
 3 MR. EPPICH: -- calls for a  
 4 legal conclusion. Scope.  
 5 Foundation.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Based on my  
 7 attorney's advice I'm not going to  
 8 answer that.  
 9 MR. FARRELL: Go to the next  
 10 video clip, please.  
 11 (Video clipped played as  
 12 follows:)  
 13 ROBERT PATTERSON: I think  
 14 when you go back to that time  
 15 frame on the suspicious orders  
 16 reports, there was two major  
 17 failures --  
 18 MR. FARRELL: Stop right  
 19 there for a second.  
 20 ROBERT PATTERSON: -- there  
 21 was either a lack of information  
 22 contained therein. Or not filing  
 23 them in -- in this instance that  
 24 they had.

1 (Video clip played as  
 2 follows:)  
 3 ROBERT PATTERSON: I think  
 4 when you go back to that time  
 5 frame on the suspicious orders  
 6 reports, there was two major  
 7 failures. One was either a lack  
 8 of information contained therein,  
 9 or not filing them in -- in this  
 10 instance that they had. I think  
 11 that started the problem, quite  
 12 frankly, and a lot of the  
 13 frustration came from chasing down  
 14 the registrants and ultimately  
 15 reminding them of their  
 16 responsibility in this regulated  
 17 area.  
 18 (Video concluded.)  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. My first question to you is,  
 21 is which registrants is he referencing?  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 23 MR. NICHOLAS: I'm going to  
 24 object on the basis that we're

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 611

1 talking about different  
2 geographical -- with different  
3 geography, this is a Track 1 case  
4 relating to Track 1 jurisdictions  
5 only. I object on that basis.  
6 These are questions about  
7 West Virginia?  
8 MR. FARRELL: Yes, sir. So  
9 for the purposes of creating a  
10 record, I understand that you're  
11 preserving that right on CT 1.  
12 However, the DOJ has requested  
13 that we not put up Mr. Prevoznik  
14 for all 1600 cases and would  
15 prefer him to just to testify  
16 once.  
17 So to the extent this is  
18 relevant to CT 2, I'm going to go  
19 down this line.  
20 MR. NICHOLAS: Are you  
21 saying that you're not going to  
22 introduce this portion of the  
23 testimony or seek to introduce it  
24 in the Track 1 case?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 613

1 Are we talking about the  
2 wholesale distributors?  
3 A. Yes.  
4 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
5 Form. Foundation.  
6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
7 Q. And then it says that the  
8 DEA was -- part of their frustration was  
9 having to chase down the registrants and  
10 remind them of their responsibilities.  
11 Can you explain what that  
12 means?  
13 What does the DEA mean when  
14 it says this to Congress?  
15 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
16 form. Calls for speculation.  
17 THE WITNESS: It means that  
18 we, with our letters in 2006, we  
19 were reiterating what their  
20 responsibility was to report  
21 suspicious orders. They may  
22 needed to -- that the registrants  
23 needed to meet effective controls  
24 to guard against diversion.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 612

1 MR. FARRELL: No. What I'm  
2 saying is you preserved your  
3 objection to this for the CT 1,  
4 and we haven't made a decision on  
5 what we'll present in CT 1 or  
6 CT 2.  
7 MR. NICHOLAS: I made my  
8 objection.  
9 MR. EPPICH: I'll further  
10 object that this -- this line of  
11 questioning lack -- he lacks  
12 foundation for it. Calls for  
13 speculation.  
14 MR. FARRELL: Who do you  
15 represent?  
16 MR. EPPICH: McKesson.  
17 MR. FARRELL: Okay. Pretty  
18 good.  
19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
20 Q. Okay. Back on -- back on  
21 the questions.  
22 My question to you is, who  
23 is the DEA referencing when they are  
24 talking about chasing down registrants.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 614

1 BY MR. FARRELL:  
2 Q. Was it the DEA's assessment  
3 during this time frame, which is 2006 and  
4 2007, was that the wholesale distributors  
5 as an industry were not complying with  
6 their regulatory duties?  
7 MR. STEPHENS: Object to  
8 form.  
9 MR. FARRELL: Excuse me.  
10 Let me -- let me make sure I  
11 finish my question before you make  
12 your objection and let -- and then  
13 we'll get it all preserved.  
14 MR. STEPHENS: I thought you  
15 were finished.  
16 MR. FARRELL: So --  
17 MR. STEPHENS: I wanted to  
18 make sure I had the objection  
19 lodged before he answered the  
20 question. I apologize.  
21 MR. FARRELL: No question.  
22 So let me repeat the  
23 question.  
24 BY MR. FARRELL:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 615

1 Q. Was it the DEA's assessment  
 2 during the time frame of 2006 and 2007  
 3 that the wholesale distributors, as an  
 4 industry, were not complying with their  
 5 regulatory duties?  
 6 MR. STEPHENS: Object to  
 7 form.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. Now, we're going to go to  
 11 the next clip.  
 12 The follow-up with the DEA  
 13 is that a congressman asked the DEA about  
 14 the settlements with industry in the  
 15 past. And asked them why the past  
 16 settlements were not effective in  
 17 achieving compliance.  
 18 Here is Mr. Patterson's  
 19 response on behalf of the DEA.  
 20 (Video clip played as  
 21 follows:)  
 22 ROBERT PATTERSON: And  
 23 again, this goes back to the  
 24 frustration of the day. And I

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 617

1 take other civil action or an  
 2 injunctive action against the  
 3 company, or we could criminally  
 4 prosecute.  
 5 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 6 Q. Was the DEA in fact  
 7 frustrated that registrants were  
 8 blatantly violating the MOUs from prior  
 9 administrative actions?  
 10 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 13 Q. And which registrants are we  
 14 talking about in particular?  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 16 Scope. I would like to go ahead  
 17 and get an objection on the record  
 18 and get a response from DOJ as  
 19 well as it relates to individual  
 20 defendants or individual  
 21 registrants.  
 22 Our understanding is that  
 23 individual registrants or  
 24 defendants are outside the scope

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 616

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 618

1 know that the -- the folks that  
 2 were in diversion back in 2010 and  
 3 2012 struggled with the fact that  
 4 these MOU or MOAs had been put in  
 5 place with these companies and  
 6 they blatantly violated them  
 7 again.  
 8 (Video concluded.)  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. So my question to you is, is  
 11 what can the DEA do if the civil  
 12 penalties that they are imposing are not  
 13 prohibitive or do not cause the wholesale  
 14 distributors to change their conduct?  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 16 Scope. Objection to form.  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 18 form. Calls for speculation.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Okay. We  
 20 could take -- we could file an  
 21 order to show cause on them. If  
 22 we could show imminent danger to  
 23 the public, we could file an ISO  
 24 against them. We could perhaps

1 of this deposition.  
 2 MS. SINGER: Just to respond  
 3 to that, I think counsel for  
 4 defendants asked numerous  
 5 questions about whether Rite Aid  
 6 or Walmart or various different  
 7 entities engaged in certain  
 8 conduct.  
 9 This is consistent with that  
 10 testimony that defendants  
 11 themselves have elicited.  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: It has nothing  
 13 to do with the scope of what has  
 14 been allowed by the --  
 15 MR. STEPHENS: Nor was I  
 16 talking about current or former  
 17 investigations.  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Well,  
 19 you're certainly not authorized to  
 20 talk about current investigations.  
 21 Topic 2 is about enforcement  
 22 activities. The clarification is,  
 23 with respect to the type of  
 24 enforcement activities, counsel

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 619

1 for plaintiffs explained that  
 2 plaintiffs seek information  
 3 regarding administrative actions  
 4 and/or settlements that DEA has  
 5 entered into with any of the  
 6 defendants, and our response is  
 7 Mr. Prevoznik is authorized.  
 8 So I'm not going to stop the  
 9 witness from answering that  
 10 question.

11 MS. MAINIGI: Mr. Prevoznik  
 12 is authorized to speak as to what?  
 13 Because with respect to our  
 14 Touhy requests, as I understand  
 15 it, and there may be somebody who  
 16 has it more at their fingertips  
 17 than I do, I believe that you  
 18 indicated that there could not be  
 19 questioning as it relates to  
 20 individual companies. And I think  
 21 it's clearly stated in the  
 22 response to one of the topics,  
 23 either 2 or 3, I believe.

24 MR. FARRELL: I'll tell you

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 621

1 that -- where I asked you generally which  
 2 registrants we are talking about.  
 3 And I'm going to go and give  
 4 you more specific information.  
 5 So the last question that  
 6 was pending and answered, I asked: "Was  
 7 the DEA in fact frustrated that  
 8 registrants were blatantly violating the  
 9 MOUs from prior administrative actions?"  
 10 And your answer was: "Yes."  
 11 There were appropriate  
 12 objections that were made that will be  
 13 resolved one day in the future. So  
 14 here's where my follow-up questions  
 15 comes.  
 16 A. Okay.  
 17 Q. Does that include Cardinal  
 18 Health's 2008 MOU and settlement which  
 19 resulted in a second DEA fine?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 22 Objection. Scope. Objection.  
 23 Form. Let me just go ahead and  
 24 begin at least noting, and then

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 620

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 622

1 what. It's ten till 12:00. If  
 2 it's okay with the DOJ, why don't  
 3 we take a lunch break now, and we  
 4 can argue about this during lunch.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Sure.  
 6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 11:53, we  
 7 are off the video record.  
 8 - - -  
 9 (Lunch break.)

10 - - -  
 11 A. F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

12 - - -  
 13 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 1:09. We  
 14 are on the video record.  
 15 - - -  
 16 EXAMINATION  
 17 (Continued)  
 18 - - -  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, when we took  
 21 our lunch break, the last question and  
 22 answer was followed by a bunch of  
 23 objections. And so what I'm going to do  
 24 is I'm going to withdraw the question

1 someone else may continue, the  
 2 fact that there was a discussion  
 3 off the record during the lunch  
 4 break between us, DOJ, as well as  
 5 the plaintiffs about the scope of  
 6 what DOJ has allowed. I don't  
 7 think that there was resolution of  
 8 that, but for the record,  
 9 defendants do object to this  
 10 ongoing line of questioning which  
 11 involves discussion of individual  
 12 defendants or individual actions  
 13 that have been taken in the past  
 14 against defendants.  
 15 MR. EPPICH: And for the  
 16 record, McKesson further objects  
 17 to the scope of this as really  
 18 outside the Touhy request. You  
 19 know, the defendants are -- see  
 20 this as seeking non-public  
 21 information, information on  
 22 ongoing investigations,  
 23 investigation that may implicate  
 24 the deliberative process or to the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 623

1 specific activities of the DEA.  
 2 The defendants have not been  
 3 permitted to question into these  
 4 lines with other witnesses or  
 5 yesterday, and the defendants  
 6 simply are requesting equality in  
 7 the application of the Touhy. And  
 8 that will be our objection on the  
 9 record.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: To be as  
 11 clear as I possibly can about the  
 12 scope of the authorization in the  
 13 hope that we don't have to keep  
 14 having this conversation, what we  
 15 have authorized is information  
 16 regarding administrative actions  
 17 and/or settlements that the DEA  
 18 has entered into with the  
 19 defendants in this case.  
 20 What we have not authorized  
 21 is information regarding  
 22 investigations that haven't  
 23 resulted in settlements, or  
 24 investigative techniques, or for

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 625

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. Acting Administrator Robert  
 3 Patterson testified that the DEA has  
 4 1,500 people to monitor 1.73 million  
 5 registrants. Is that an accurate number?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 7 form. Vague.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 9 (Whereupon, a discussion was  
 10 held off the record.)  
 11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 1:14, we  
 12 are off the video record.  
 13 (Brief pause.)  
 14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 1:17. We  
 15 are on the video record.  
 16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 17 Q. Again, the last reference  
 18 that I'm going to bring up with regard to  
 19 Mr. Patterson's testimony before Congress  
 20 on behalf of the DEA, is a segment that  
 21 again talks about the shortcomings in the  
 22 use of the ARCOM data historically.  
 23 MR. FARRELL: Would you  
 24 please play that clip.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 624

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 626

1 that matter deliberative process  
 2 or law enforcement sensitive  
 3 information.  
 4 I will continue to make  
 5 appropriate objections, and where  
 6 appropriate instruct the witness  
 7 not to answer. The defendants  
 8 have made their objections and  
 9 have preserved them for the  
 10 record.  
 11 You can answer.  
 12 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 13 Q. Does that include McKesson's  
 14 2008 MOU and settlement which resulted in  
 15 a second DEA fine?  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 17 Scope.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. I'm not going to play this  
 21 video clip. Instead I'm going to ask it  
 22 in a form of a question.  
 23 During the same testimony  
 24 acting -- is it administrator?

1 (Video clip played as  
 2 follows:)  
 3 MR. PATTERSON: So the key  
 4 is for us to work together on  
 5 that, and again, I can say  
 6 repeatedly in 2008, '9, '10, we  
 7 did not use this data in the way  
 8 that we are now using it. And I  
 9 think that's the key.  
 10 I get that we have this  
 11 issue from a decade ago that we  
 12 have to resolve, you know, in  
 13 terms of how we use it. And  
 14 again, where we fell short in  
 15 that, we'll take responsibility  
 16 for it.  
 17 (Video playback ended.)  
 18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 19 Q. So has the DEA, in fact,  
 20 changed the way in which they are using  
 21 the ARCOM data?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. And to be clear, to be  
 24 clear, what we are talking about is the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 627

1 DEA's use of the ARCOM data to  
 2 retrospectively identify and prosecute  
 3 criminals?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. I apologize that I'm going  
 8 to jump out of order. There is a system  
 9 to my madness.  
 10 What I'm going to do is, is  
 11 I'm going to hit one particular subject  
 12 here, and then I'm going to go back  
 13 and -- and ask some questions as if, you  
 14 know, a priority from the beginning.  
 15 A. Okay.  
 16 Q. So my question is this. I  
 17 want to -- I want to ask you if the DEA  
 18 agrees with the following statement from  
 19 Cardinal Health:  
 20 "Cardinal Health's policy  
 21 about which it informed DEA as early as  
 22 2009, was that if a customer's order  
 23 could not be filled because it was  
 24 suspicious, Cardinal Health would

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 629

1 wholesale distributor gets a flag of a  
 2 suspicious order, that they've determined  
 3 to be a suspicious order, and that they  
 4 block that shipment, that they should  
 5 terminate all future sales to that same  
 6 customer until they can rule out that  
 7 diversion is occurring?  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 9 Form. Objection. Scope. Calls  
 10 for a hypothetical.  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 12 the foundation. Calls for  
 13 speculation.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, I would  
 15 agree.  
 16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 17 Q. The same thing applies to a  
 18 document involving McKesson.  
 19 On August 13, 2014, the  
 20 United States Department of Justice was  
 21 communicating with the lawyer for  
 22 McKesson which ended up resulting in a  
 23 \$150 million fine.  
 24 And in this discussion, the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 628

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 630

1 terminate controlled substance sales to  
 2 the customer and report the termination  
 3 to the DEA."  
 4 Do you understand what I  
 5 just read to you?  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 7 Form. Objection. Scope.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Can I get the  
 9 first -- the first part of the  
 10 question?  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. Yes. So specifically what  
 13 I'm referencing is Cardinal Health's  
 14 reply brief, in Cardinal Health versus  
 15 Eric Holder, which was a preliminary  
 16 injunction filed by Cardinal Health in a  
 17 DC District Court. And in it -- in the  
 18 reply brief there's a provision in here  
 19 that I read to you. And in essence what  
 20 it says is that if you get a suspicious  
 21 order, and you block it, that Cardinal  
 22 Health would terminate that customer and  
 23 not sell to it anymore.  
 24 Do you agree that if a

1 DEA notes, and I'm reading from Bates  
 2 Stamp MCKMDL 00409224, that the McKesson  
 3 operations manual says the following  
 4 quote:  
 5 "Once McKesson deems an  
 6 order and/or a customer suspicious,  
 7 McKesson is required to act. This means  
 8 all controlled substance sales to that  
 9 customer must cease and the DEA must be  
 10 notified."  
 11 Does the DEA agree with  
 12 those duties?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 15 Scope. Objection to the extent it  
 16 mischaracterizes the document.  
 17 Lacks foundation. Calls for  
 18 speculation. Form.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: The  
 20 witness has answered the question.  
 21 I just note that there are  
 22 no documents in front of him.  
 23 There are no exhibits. If you're  
 24 going to ask him about exhibits,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 631

1 then you should mark them as  
 2 exhibits.  
 3 MR. FARRELL: I can  
 4 absolutely do that. And -- and I  
 5 think that I was trying to save us  
 6 some time. To the extent that  
 7 I've misread anything or the  
 8 context of it, I apologize.  
 9 We have those documents and  
 10 I can circulate them. I'm just  
 11 trying to create a quick record  
 12 before we move on.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: It's your  
 14 deposition.  
 15 MR. EPPICH: We'll have an  
 16 ongoing objection then, to the  
 17 extent you're reading from a  
 18 document that's not in front of us  
 19 to check, and -- and where you  
 20 haven't established a foundation,  
 21 then we will obviously object.  
 22 MR. FARRELL: So if it's --  
 23 if it's not clear, I'm trying to  
 24 create a record for our experts as

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 633

1 legal conclusion.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. The foundation of our  
 5 democracy arises out of the U.S. code.  
 6 So I'm going to ask a couple of general  
 7 questions about some code provisions that  
 8 I'm sure you're very familiar with.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 10 Outside the scope.  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. The first one is the statute  
 13 of United States Code Section 801. And I  
 14 ask for it to be shown on the screen.  
 15 So you've been asked in the  
 16 past, with the focus on Subparagraph 1,  
 17 that many of the controlled substances  
 18 that are distributed in America,  
 19 prescribed and dispensed, have a useful  
 20 and legitimate medical purpose and that  
 21 they are necessary to maintain the health  
 22 and general welfare of the American  
 23 people.  
 24 That's a true statement, is

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 632

1 well.  
 2 MR. EPPICH: I got that,  
 3 thank you.  
 4 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 5 Q. So, cleaning up a couple of  
 6 other things.  
 7 There was some testimony  
 8 yesterday, or today actually, from my  
 9 learned colleague, that 1.2 million  
 10 suspicious orders were reported to the  
 11 DEA between 2007 and 2018.  
 12 Do you recall that  
 13 testimony?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 17 Q. If those suspicious orders  
 18 were filled, is that a, per se, violation  
 19 of federal law?  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 21 form.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 24 Calls for speculation, calls for a

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 634

1 it not?  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 3 Form.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same scope  
 5 objection. I allowed the  
 6 defendants to ask so I'll allow  
 7 you to ask.  
 8 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 9 Q. So we're going to skip down  
 10 to the part they omitted, which is  
 11 Subparagraph 2, and I'd ask for you to  
 12 read that into the record.  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 14 THE WITNESS: "The illegal  
 15 importation, manufacture,  
 16 distribution and possession and  
 17 improper use of controlled  
 18 substances have a substantial and  
 19 detrimental effect on the health  
 20 and general welfare of the  
 21 American people."  
 22 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 23 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 24 guidance provided by the DEA to

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 635

1 registrants?  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 3 Vague.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 5 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 6 Q. The next provision is  
 7 Section 812. And this is the scheduling  
 8 of -- by the United States Congress,  
 9 which identifies Schedule II drugs, which  
 10 include prescription opioids.  
 11 And Subparagraph A, would  
 12 you please read into the record?  
 13 A. "The drug or other substance  
 14 has" -- "has a high potential for abuse."  
 15 Q. Subparagraph B?  
 16 A. "The drug or other substance  
 17 has a currently accepted medical use and  
 18 treatment in the United States or a  
 19 currently accepted medical use with  
 20 severe restrictions."  
 21 Q. And Paragraph C?  
 22 A. "Abuse of the drug or other  
 23 substances may lead to severe  
 24 psychological or physical dependence."

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 637

1 And it includes a duty imposed upon the  
 2 registrants to comply with Paragraph 1.  
 3 Will you please read that into the  
 4 record?  
 5 A. "Maintenance of effective  
 6 control against diversion of particular  
 7 controlled substances into other than  
 8 legitimate medical, scientific, and  
 9 industrial channels."  
 10 Q. And is this consistent with  
 11 the guidance provided by the DEA to  
 12 registrants?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 14 form. Vague.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.  
 16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 17 Q. Now, the next thing that I'm  
 18 going to do is to peer a little bit  
 19 deeper into some congressional intent  
 20 from the congressional record.  
 21 MR. FARRELL: Can you pull  
 22 up the next slide.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. I'm not going to ask you to

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 636

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 638

1 Q. And are these provisions  
 2 consistent with the guidance provided by  
 3 the DEA to registrants?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 5 form. Vague.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. Go to the next section which  
 9 is Section 821. This is the enabling  
 10 statute from the United States Congress  
 11 that authorizes the Attorney General to  
 12 promulgate regulations regarding  
 13 prescription opioids.  
 14 Has, in fact, the DEA used  
 15 this authority to enact, in particular,  
 16 21 C.F.R. 1301.74?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 18 a legal conclusion. You can  
 19 answer.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. Go to the next slide. And  
 23 this is the United States Code Section,  
 24 which has a registration requirement.

1 be a legal scholar or an academic  
 2 scholar. I'm going to ask you some  
 3 specific questions.  
 4 This comes from the  
 5 congressional record from the 1970  
 6 Controlled Substances Act.  
 7 MR. FARRELL: And so if  
 8 you'll go to the next slide.  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. Title II, Control  
 11 Enforcement, states, "This bill provides  
 12 for control by the Justice Department of  
 13 problems related to drug abuse through  
 14 registration of manufacturers,  
 15 wholesalers, retailers, and all others in  
 16 the legitimate distribution chain, and  
 17 makes transactions outside the legitimate  
 18 distribution chain illegal."  
 19 Is this consistent with the  
 20 guidance the DEA provided to registrants?  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 23 form.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Yes.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 639

1 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 2 Q. If you violate Section 823,  
 3 or the provisions, the regulations  
 4 enacted by the DEA related to the  
 5 distribution of controlled substances,  
 6 those acts are illegal. Agreed or  
 7 disagree?  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 9 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Agreed.  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. The DEA considers violation  
 13 of federal law related to the  
 14 distribution of controlled substances as  
 15 illegal and unlawful?  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 17 form.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 19 MR. FARRELL: Go to the next  
 20 slide.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. The quote from the  
 23 congressional record is, "The bill is  
 24 designed to improve the administration

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 641

1 A. Yes.  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. And your answer was, "No,  
 5 not every suspicious order results in  
 6 diversion. That's my recollection."  
 7 I would like to ask you some  
 8 corollary to that if you don't mind.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Okay.  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. You would agree with me --  
 13 strike that.  
 14 Does the DEA take the  
 15 position that the purpose of the  
 16 Controlled Substances Act and its federal  
 17 regulations is to prevent diversion?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. And diversion is foreseeable  
 20 if registrants fail to comply with  
 21 federal law?  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 640

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 642

1 and regulation by the manufacturer" --  
 2 "by the manufacturing, distribution and  
 3 dispensing of controlled substances by  
 4 providing a quote-unquote closed system  
 5 of drug distribution for legitimate  
 6 handlers of such drugs.  
 7 "Such a closed system should  
 8 significantly reduce the widespread  
 9 diversion of these drugs out of  
 10 legitimate channels into the illicit  
 11 market, while at the same time providing  
 12 the legitimate drug industry with a  
 13 unified approach to narcotic and  
 14 dangerous drug control."  
 15 Is this consistent with the  
 16 guidance provided by the DEA to  
 17 registrants?  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 19 Vague.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. You were asked previously  
 23 whether every suspicious order results in  
 24 diversion. Do you recall that testimony?

1 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 2 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. Does the DEA agree that  
 4 diversion is foreseeable if registrants  
 5 fail to comply with federal law?  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 8 Form. Calls for a legal  
 9 conclusion. Vague.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. And failure to comply  
 13 enables more diversion. Does the DEA  
 14 agree with that?  
 15 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection to  
 16 form.  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 18 MR. STEPHENS: Objection.  
 19 MR. NICHOLAS: Objection.  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Calls for a  
 22 legal conclusion.  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Join as to  
 24 vagueness.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 643

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 2 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. Does the DEA believe that  
 4 more diversion is detrimental to public  
 5 health and safety?  
 6 MR. O'CONNOR: Object to  
 7 form. Scope.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. Does the DEA agree that the  
 11 more pills which unlawfully enter the  
 12 market results in more diversion?  
 13 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection to  
 14 form. Scope.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 MR. FARRELL: Go to the next  
 17 slide.  
 18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 19 Q. This is a provision about  
 20 penalties. Does the DEA agree that the  
 21 price for participation in illegal  
 22 traffic of controlled substances should  
 23 be prohibitive?  
 24 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 645

1 III of the bill deal with law enforcement  
 2 and aspects of drug abuse and provide  
 3 authority for the Department of Justice  
 4 to keep track of all drugs subject to  
 5 abuse manufactured or distributed in the  
 6 United States in order to prevent  
 7 diversion of these drugs from legitimate  
 8 channels of commerce.  
 9 Is this consistent with the  
 10 guidance provided by DEA to registrants?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 12 form. Vague.  
 13 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 14 Scope.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 MR. FARRELL: Next slide,  
 17 please.  
 18 Next slide.  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. Congress found the illegal  
 21 importation, manufacture, distribution  
 22 and possession of improper use of  
 23 controlled substances have a substantial  
 24 detrimental effect on the public's health

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 644

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 2 form, foundation.  
 3 MR. STEPHENS: Objection.  
 4 MR. NICHOLAS: Objection.  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 6 MR. O'CONNOR: Scope.  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Calls for  
 8 speculation.  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 10 You can answer.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 13 Q. Is this one of the reasons  
 14 that the DEA has escalated the amount of  
 15 fines that it has levied against  
 16 registrants that are repeated violators?  
 17 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 18 Leading.  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 20 form. Calls for speculation.  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. Next slide. Titles II and

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 646

1 and general welfare.  
 2 Does the DEA agree with this  
 3 statement, and is this consistent with  
 4 the guidance provided by the DEA to  
 5 registrants?  
 6 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection to  
 7 form and to scope.  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 9 the extent it misstates the  
 10 document.  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL: Very well.  
 12 That's a good point. I'll back  
 13 up.  
 14 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 15 Q. In the congressional record  
 16 is the following statement:  
 17 "The illegal importation,  
 18 manufacture, distribution and possession  
 19 and improper use of controlled substances  
 20 have a substantial detrimental effect on  
 21 the public's health and general welfare."  
 22 Does the DEA agree with this  
 23 statement?  
 24 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection to

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 647

1 form and scope.  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 3 Calls for speculation.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. Is this statement consistent  
 8 with the guidance provided by the DEA to  
 9 registrants?  
 10 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection to  
 11 form and scope.  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 13 Vague.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 MR. FARRELL: Next slide  
 16 please.  
 17 There's no more?  
 18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 19 Q. All right. Now we're going  
 20 to dig a little bit deeper. These aren't  
 21 the congressional record. This comes  
 22 from the hearing involving the 1970  
 23 Controlled Substances Act.  
 24 So, if you go to the front

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 649

1 MR. FARRELL: Sure.  
 2 MR. NICHOLAS: I don't want  
 3 to mess with your flow here, but  
 4 you're showing these documents  
 5 that are not -- they are not --  
 6 they are not being offered as  
 7 evidence. They are not being  
 8 marked.  
 9 It's a direct examination.  
 10 I kind of feel like there needs to  
 11 be a little more formality to the  
 12 presentation. Like, you know,  
 13 these have to be exhibits or  
 14 something, right?  
 15 MR. FARRELL: Noted.  
 16 MR. NICHOLAS: So that's my  
 17 objection. I don't think you  
 18 should be able to proceed in this  
 19 manner without sort of producing  
 20 these things as exhibits or laying  
 21 a foundation for these documents.  
 22 MR. FARRELL: I will note we  
 23 spent most of the morning doing  
 24 the exact same thing with other

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 648

1 page, this is a 900-page document that --  
 2 from the -- I always mispronounce this.  
 3 The HathiTrust? HathiTrust?  
 4 And it contains all of the  
 5 hearings that are -- that surrounded the  
 6 enactment of the 1970 Controlled  
 7 Substances Act. And there's some  
 8 particular statements that are made. I'm  
 9 not going to ask you to verify them. I'm  
 10 going to just ask whether the DEA agrees  
 11 or disagrees with the premise.  
 12 The first one comes from a  
 13 statement of the manager of -- of  
 14 distribution from a firm called Smith,  
 15 Kline & French Laboratories.  
 16 If you --  
 17 MR. NICHOLAS: I'll  
 18 object -- I'm sorry. I don't want  
 19 to interrupt. If you're not done,  
 20 keep going.  
 21 MR. FARRELL: So if you'll  
 22 go ahead and pull it up.  
 23 MR. NICHOLAS: Okay. Can I  
 24 just interpose an objection?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 650

1 aspects of the congressional  
 2 record.  
 3 MR. NICHOLAS: This is a  
 4 direct examination.  
 5 MR. FARRELL: Understood.  
 6 So -- can we stipulate to that?  
 7 MR. NICHOLAS: I mean, it's  
 8 your position that it's a direct,  
 9 right?  
 10 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. All right. So if we go to  
 12 Page 269, I'm going to read to you this  
 13 statement:  
 14 "We cannot overemphasize,  
 15 however, that no regulatory program will  
 16 work unless it is backed by sufficient  
 17 manpower and resources to do what it is  
 18 designed to do. The federal and state  
 19 enforcement agencies in the drug field  
 20 are all too well aware of this truism.  
 21 They are often the target for unjustified  
 22 public criticism for not doing a job that  
 23 would take many times their present  
 24 resources to do."

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 651

1 The D --  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Go ahead.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. Does the DEA agree with this  
 5 statement?  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 7 form, scope.  
 8 And can we see a copy of  
 9 this, Counsel? Because we have no  
 10 way to know what exactly you are  
 11 reading from within this document.  
 12 MR. FULLER: Here you go.  
 13 MS. MAINIGI: What page?  
 14 MR. FARRELL: 269.  
 15 Go to the next slide,  
 16 please.  
 17 MR. EPPICH: I'll object to  
 18 foundation.  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. Go to the next slide,  
 21 please.  
 22 This is a statement from the  
 23 Washington representative for the  
 24 National Association of Retail Druggists.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 653

1 response is:  
 2 "I don't believe there are  
 3 either. I think this is a factor and I  
 4 can certainly appreciate your concern. I  
 5 think, Mr. Chairman, that you put your  
 6 finger on the real problem that has to be  
 7 dealt with."  
 8 So my question to the DEA:  
 9 Is this consistent with the DEA's  
 10 understanding of the purpose and effect  
 11 of the Controlled Substances Act, as well  
 12 as the regulations enabled thereunder, is  
 13 to prevent diversion that happens in the  
 14 entire chain of distribution?  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 16 MR. O'CONNOR: And scope.  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 18 Outside the scope as well.  
 19 MR. NICHOLAS: Can we -- can  
 20 we know the date of this  
 21 statement, when it was made?  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: It is in 1970  
 23 prior to opioids that are at issue  
 24 here.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 652

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 654

1 "MR. ROGERS. As we ask  
 2 groups as they come in where they feel  
 3 diversion comes from or illegal traffic,  
 4 when you get to the manufacturers, they  
 5 don't feel that" -- "that any comes from  
 6 there.  
 7 "Then we get to the  
 8 wholesaler, and they don't think there is  
 9 any there. And then we get down to the  
 10 doctors and they tell us it is not in  
 11 that segment, and the retail druggist now  
 12 tells us there is none there. Well,  
 13 where do you feel all of this comes from?  
 14 We have 900 agents supposedly to track  
 15 all of this down and they come up with  
 16 4,000 arrests, five per man for the year.  
 17 I don't know how society gets inundated  
 18 with all of these drugs from no sources.  
 19 Where do you think it mainly comes from?  
 20 I don't believe there are enough  
 21 robberies out of warehouses to supply all  
 22 of this."  
 23 And then from the National  
 24 Association of Retail Druggists, their

1 MR. NICHOLAS: Is that  
 2 correct, it's a pre-1970  
 3 statement?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Are you  
 5 guys done with objections?  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Well, it says  
 7 1970.  
 8 Paul, could you clarify  
 9 though. Is it 1970?  
 10 MR. FARRELL: I've already  
 11 made the record that I'm going to  
 12 make.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Once you  
 14 are done -- are you guys done?  
 15 MR. NICHOLAS: Yeah.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I object  
 17 to the scope. Vague.  
 18 You can answer if you  
 19 understand.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. Even if it's not admissible,  
 23 you agree with me that's pretty  
 24 consistent with what the DEA hears today

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 655

1 from those in the chain of distribution.  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 3 MR. O'CONNOR: And scope.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 5 repeat the question?  
 6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. Even if this is from 1970,  
 8 are those sentiments that we just read  
 9 consistent with what the DEA presently  
 10 hears from the manufacturers,  
 11 distributors, doctors, and pharmacies in  
 12 the chain of distribution?  
 13 MR. STEPHENS: Object to  
 14 form.  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 16 MR. O'CONNOR: Object to  
 17 scope.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. All right. The next thing  
 21 we're going to go to is the C.F.R. that  
 22 Congress enabled to be adopted. And the  
 23 first thing is going to be from March 13,  
 24 1971 and it's the rule proposal. And

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 657

1 you read that.  
 2 A. "Many manufacturers and  
 3 distributors objected to security  
 4 controls set forth in 301.91 to 301.97."  
 5 Q. And I'll represent to you  
 6 that these provisions they are  
 7 referencing are in fact the security  
 8 requirements in 1301.74(b). And I'll ask  
 9 the DEA: Do you still have records of  
 10 the objections lodged by manufacturers  
 11 and distributors to this regulatory  
 12 provision?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 14 form.  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 16 form, foundation, scope.  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Object to  
 18 scope. This is way outside of  
 19 Topic 1 of plaintiffs' topics.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 21 You can answer.  
 22 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 23 Q. If you know.  
 24 A. I don't know.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 656

1 we're going to flip down to Page 9.  
 2 Does the DEA recognize the  
 3 structure of this provision?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 6 Foundation. Scope. Form.  
 7 MR. FARRELL: Well, the  
 8 foundation of this exhibit is this  
 9 is part of the rulemaking process  
 10 which resulted in the adoption of  
 11 21 C.F.R. 1301.74.  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: I don't think  
 13 you can testify, Mr. Farrell. You  
 14 have to establish foundation in  
 15 other ways.  
 16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 17 Q. The next slide I'm going to  
 18 show you comes from once public notice  
 19 was made for this provision.  
 20 MR. FARRELL: Will you  
 21 please show that.  
 22 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 23 Q. It comes from April 24,  
 24 1971. At the very top of it, I'll have

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 658

1 Q. Is it something that DEA can  
 2 look into for me?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Same  
 4 objections.  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. Because it would be swell  
 9 if, like, some of the manufacturers and  
 10 distributors that are here objecting to  
 11 the DEA have been objecting since 1971.  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: Is that a  
 13 question?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 15 the characterization.  
 16 MR. FARRELL: That was just  
 17 commentary.  
 18 MR. EPPICH: I know.  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. The next slide is going to  
 21 be the actual regulation that exists  
 22 today, which is 21 C.F.R. 1301.74(b).  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: That's not  
 24 it.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 659

1 MR. STEPHENS: Paul, just  
 2 for clarification, are you marking  
 3 these so that we have a hard copy  
 4 that we can use in redirect?  
 5 You're just throwing stuff up on  
 6 the screen and playing stuff and  
 7 moving on.  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: And sometimes  
 9 not even waiting for an answer.  
 10 MR. FARRELL: Understood.  
 11 MR. STEPHENS: Do you  
 12 understand my point? If you're  
 13 using a document, I want to see  
 14 the whole document so if I've got  
 15 questions that I can use it in  
 16 redirect.  
 17 MR. FARRELL: We do have  
 18 copies. You've got copies of  
 19 stuff here too. Yeah, we got  
 20 copies.  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: I thought you  
 22 were sending these all  
 23 electronically.  
 24 MR. FARRELL: I think you

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 661

1 registrant suspicious orders of  
 2 controlled substances. The registrant  
 3 shall inform the field division office of  
 4 the administration in his area of  
 5 suspicious orders when discovered by the  
 6 registrant.  
 7 "Suspicious orders include  
 8 orders of unusual size, orders deviating  
 9 substantially from a normal pattern, and  
 10 orders of unusual frequency."  
 11 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 12 guidance provided by the DEA to  
 13 registrants?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. And has this regulation  
 16 materially changed since it was  
 17 originally enacted in 1971?  
 18 A. No.  
 19 Q. All right. The next  
 20 document that I'm going to show you comes  
 21 from discovery in this case. And it's  
 22 the NWDA suspicious order monitoring  
 23 system.  
 24 And I believe that the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 660

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 662

1 scoffed at me when I made that  
 2 recommendation.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: I did laugh at  
 4 you. That's true. But I thought  
 5 you were still doing it.  
 6 MR. FARRELL: We'll move on.  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. I've shown you up on the  
 9 screen, which is a verbatim copy of --  
 10 from the regulations enacted.  
 11 Does the DEA recognize and  
 12 acknowledge that 21 C.F.R. 1301.74 is a  
 13 regulation enacted and under its  
 14 authority?  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 18 a legal conclusion.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 21 Q. And would you please read  
 22 subparagraph (b) into the record?  
 23 A. "The registrant shall design  
 24 and operate a system to disclose to the

1 government has it included in its folder,  
 2 its materials file.  
 3 Have you seen this document  
 4 before?  
 5 A. Can I see more than that?  
 6 Q. I think it's under -- it's  
 7 in one --  
 8 A. In my tabs, my folder?  
 9 Q. Yeah.  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. I'll give you a second if  
 12 you want to flip through it.  
 13 A. That's all I see.  
 14 I'm familiar with this.  
 15 Q. This is a document that was  
 16 in the files of Cardinal Health. And  
 17 it's stamped as received in 1993, but  
 18 I'll represent to you that it contains  
 19 some older 1984 references later on.  
 20 I'm going just to ask you a  
 21 few basic questions about it. And I'll  
 22 represent to you that the NWDA is a trade  
 23 group for the wholesale distributors at  
 24 some point in time.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 663

1 Go to Page 3.  
 2 MR. FARRELL: Take that down  
 3 first if you don't mind. I'm  
 4 sorry. I was talking to John.  
 5 Take out the blowup.  
 6 Go ahead. Put it back up.  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. So this is something very  
 9 specific that I want to ask the DEA.  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 11 Let me object first to the manner  
 12 in which you're questioning. You  
 13 cannot be testifying about various  
 14 aspects of this document.  
 15 But objection. Form.  
 16 Foundation. This guy hasn't --  
 17 this is not a DEA document.  
 18 You're essentially trying to use  
 19 him as a vehicle to get testimony  
 20 from the document itself. It's  
 21 ridiculous and objectionable and  
 22 outside the scope.  
 23 MR. FARRELL: You can make  
 24 your objections without making

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 665

1 Form. Scope. Foundation.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. Okay. Cardinal Health has  
 5 represented that the DEA provided that  
 6 factor to them for controlled substances.  
 7 Is the DEA aware of ever providing the  
 8 factor for the current month ingredient  
 9 limit to anybody in industry?  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 11 Form. Scope. Foundation.  
 12 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
 13 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 14 Q. Go all the way to Page 7.  
 15 In the middle of the page in Paragraph 9,  
 16 "Single suspicious orders." For purposes  
 17 of context I'd like you to read this  
 18 aloud.  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 20 form, scope, foundation.  
 21 THE WITNESS: "Single orders  
 22 of unusual size or deviation must  
 23 be reported immediately. The  
 24 submission of a monthly printout

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 664

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 666

1 demeaning comments. So I'm going  
 2 to ask you --  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Okay. Well,  
 4 it is a mockery of the process.  
 5 MR. FARRELL: That's your  
 6 second demeaning comment. The  
 7 third one, we'll get the special  
 8 master on the phone.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: That's fine.  
 10 I actually would love that. Go  
 11 ahead.  
 12 MR. FARRELL: We can do it  
 13 on a break after we get through  
 14 this document.  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Sounds fine to  
 16 me.  
 17 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 18 Q. So what I'm going to ask you  
 19 is, if you look in the middle of the page  
 20 where it says, "Current month ingredient  
 21 limit," and then there's a note that says  
 22 "NN.NN will be provided by the DEA."  
 23 Do you see that?  
 24 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

1 of after-the-fact sales will not  
 2 relieve a registrant from the  
 3 responsibility of reporting these  
 4 single excessive or suspicious  
 5 orders.  
 6 "DEA has interpreted orders  
 7 to mean prior to shipment."  
 8 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 9 Q. Is this statement consistent  
 10 with the guidance provided by the DEA to  
 11 registrants?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 15 MR. STEPHENS: Objection.  
 16 MR. NICHOLAS: Objection.  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 18 Form.  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Foundation,  
 20 form, calls for speculation.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. I'm not asking you to  
 23 speculate. As a matter of fact, is this  
 24 consistent with what the DEA has told its

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 667

1 registrants is required to comply with  
 2 federal law?  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 5 Form. Foundation. Calls for  
 6 speculation. Vague as to time.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'll join  
 8 the objection as to the vagueness  
 9 as to time.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. Is the DEA aware of ever in  
 13 its history of saying anything  
 14 inconsistent with what you just read?  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 16 Form, foundation, calls for  
 17 speculation, outside the scope.  
 18 THE WITNESS: I have --  
 19 could you -- could you re-read it?  
 20 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 21 Q. I'll strike it. I got the  
 22 answer. I'll strike it.  
 23 The next thing I'm going to  
 24 do is I'm going to show you from Page 8,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 669

1 Q. When you look at the  
 2 reliance materials that you have in front  
 3 of you, you can flip through it and find  
 4 if it's not in the back.  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 6 Form, foundation.  
 7 THE WITNESS: No.  
 8 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 9 Q. Okay. So what I'm going to  
 10 ask you is, is to flip to Page 2 and see  
 11 Mr. Thomas Gitchell, acting chief  
 12 diversion of operations section. Are you  
 13 familiar with Mr. Gitchell?  
 14 A. Yes, I know who he -- I know  
 15 who he is.  
 16 Q. Is Mr. Gitchell authorized  
 17 to speak on behalf of the DEA at this  
 18 time?  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 20 Outside the scope. Form.  
 21 Foundation.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 23 Vague.  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Objection.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 668

1 attached to this in the Cardinal Health  
 2 files, is a cover sheet that says letters  
 3 from DEA approving the format.  
 4 And if you look, the first  
 5 letter is dated April 27, 1984.  
 6 Are you familiar with this  
 7 correspondence?  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 9 Outside the scope. It's 1984.  
 10 Form and foundation.  
 11 MR. FARRELL: Well, the  
 12 irony of it is, is that Cardinal  
 13 Health specifically referenced  
 14 this document in its combined  
 15 discovery responses.  
 16 So I'm going to ask you --  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the  
 18 scope of this deposition.  
 19 MR. FARRELL: I'm going to  
 20 ask the witness again --  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. Are you familiar with this  
 23 document?  
 24 A. No.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 670

1 Calls for speculation.  
 2 MR. FARRELL: It can't be  
 3 speculation. It's the DEA  
 4 testifying on whether or not the  
 5 chief of the diversion operation  
 6 section has the authority to make  
 7 statements on behalf of the DEA.  
 8 MR. EPPICH: In 1983?  
 9 MR. FARRELL: Correct.  
 10 Which is reliance by Cardinal  
 11 Health and others as to its  
 12 suspicious order monitoring  
 13 system.  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Outside the  
 15 scope of the authorization.  
 16 MR. FARRELL: It's -- this  
 17 is going to be related to the  
 18 guidance provided by the DEA.  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Well, we'll let  
 20 him answer.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. So, go back to the prior --  
 23 prior page. All right.  
 24 So taking off --

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 671

1 MR. FARRELL: If you'll take  
 2 off the blow-off first.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. The date is April 27, 1984.  
 5 You'll see in the bottom right-hand  
 6 corner this is a document that is in the  
 7 Cardinal Health files.  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 9 Form, scope, foundation.  
 10 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. And so I'm going to ask that  
 12 the -- that the main paragraph be blown  
 13 up so we can read it.  
 14 So the NWDA policy that  
 15 was -- that we just walked through, is  
 16 what this reference is to.  
 17 And I'd ask for you to read  
 18 it, the portion that's highlighted.  
 19 A. "The NWDA's draft format for  
 20 a suspicious order" -- "order monitoring  
 21 system provides an excellent framework  
 22 for distributor registrants to design and  
 23 operate a system to disclose to the  
 24 registrant suspicious orders of

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 673

1 to time.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. Now, go to the final  
 5 sentence. Will you please read this  
 6 aloud?  
 7 A. "As previously discussed, an  
 8 after-the-fact computer printout of sales  
 9 data does not relieve a registrant of its  
 10 responsibility to report excessive or  
 11 suspicious orders when discovered. I am  
 12 enclosing a copy of your draft with my  
 13 pen and ink changes."  
 14 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 15 guidance provided by the DEA to  
 16 registrants?  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 18 Form, scope, foundation.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 21 Q. Is after the fact reporting  
 22 of suspicious orders in full compliance  
 23 with federal law?  
 24 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 672

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 674

1 controlled substances."  
 2 Q. Very good.  
 3 Now I'd like you to read the  
 4 next sentence.  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 6 Form, scope, foundation.  
 7 THE WITNESS: "However, I am  
 8 compelled to note, as I have in  
 9 our previous discussions, that any  
 10 automated data processing system  
 11 may provide the means and  
 12 mechanism for compliance when the  
 13 data is carefully reviewed and  
 14 monitored by the wholesaler."  
 15 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 16 Q. Is this statement consistent  
 17 with guidance provided by the DEA to  
 18 registrants?  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 20 Outside the scope. Form,  
 21 foundation.  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 23 Vague.  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague as

1 Form, scope, foundation, and vague  
 2 as to time.  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 4 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 6 repeat it?  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. Has after the fact reporting  
 9 of suspicious orders ever been in  
 10 compliance with federal law according to  
 11 the DEA's guidance provided to  
 12 registrants?  
 13 A. No.  
 14 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 15 Form, foundation.  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 17 Vague.  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: For -- for  
 19 the witness and Paul, we'll go  
 20 another half hour and then take a  
 21 break.  
 22 MR. FARRELL: Yeah, actually  
 23 I've got one more page and then it  
 24 might be a good break point.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 675

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 2 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. So from the Cardinal Health  
 4 files comes a second letter from the DEA.  
 5 And it's dated approximately three weeks  
 6 later, May 16, 1984. And it's again from  
 7 the DEA.  
 8 This letter was specifically  
 9 referenced by Cardinal Health in its  
 10 discovery responses as a blessing of  
 11 after the fact reporting of suspicious  
 12 orders. I'll represent that to you.  
 13 So what I'd like you to do  
 14 is we're going to blow up the first  
 15 paragraph and we're going to walk through  
 16 it again.  
 17 Do you see there right in  
 18 the middle? Would you read the  
 19 highlighted provision?  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 21 Form, foundation, scope.  
 22 THE WITNESS: "In order to  
 23 clarify any misinterpretations, I  
 24 want to assure you that the DEA

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 677

1 question on the record. Yesterday  
 2 we were prohibited --  
 3 MR. FARRELL: Hold on. You  
 4 can do it after he finishes  
 5 answering the question.  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Well, I know.  
 7 They can answer whenever they want  
 8 to, but --  
 9 MR. FARRELL: Counsel for  
 10 Cardinal, I'm going to ask you not  
 11 to make another speaking  
 12 objection.  
 13 MS. MAINIGI: It's --  
 14 MR. FARRELL: Your objection  
 15 is made, it's on the record. And  
 16 then you can create whatever  
 17 record you want as soon as the  
 18 witness is done.  
 19 So I'm going to ask the  
 20 witness to read the highlighted  
 21 section.  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: My question  
 23 is, yesterday --  
 24 MR. FARRELL: You are

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 676

1 fully supports the NWDA effort to  
 2 introduce a uniform reporting  
 3 system among its members."  
 4 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 5 Q. And then the very next  
 6 sentence, please read it. This is the  
 7 one quoted by Cardinal Health.  
 8 A. This --  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 10 Form, foundation, scope.  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 12 characterization.  
 13 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 14 Q. Go ahead.  
 15 A. "This system as proposed  
 16 will meet the reporting requirements of  
 17 21 C.F.R. 1301.74(b)."  
 18 Q. Now, what I'd like you to do  
 19 is read the next sentence which is  
 20 omitted from the discovery responses  
 21 filed by Cardinal Health.  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 23 Form, foundation, and scope.  
 24 And DOJ, I'd like to ask a

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 678

1 becoming disruptive. You're  
 2 becoming disruptive.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Then --  
 4 MR. FARRELL: And you are  
 5 intervening. And -- and we will  
 6 get Special Master Cohen on.  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: That's fine.  
 8 I was prohibited from  
 9 asking, or somebody was prohibited  
 10 from asking the question --  
 11 MR. FARRELL: If  
 12 Judge Polster were sitting here  
 13 right now, he would sanction you.  
 14 MS. MAINIGI: Well, then I  
 15 guess lucky for me he is not. But  
 16 will you let me get my objection  
 17 out?  
 18 MR. FARRELL: No, this is my  
 19 direct testimony, and you're  
 20 making a speaking objection.  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Just like you  
 22 made yesterday multiple times.  
 23 But this is a question to  
 24 the DEA. It's not a speaking

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 679

1 objection.  
 2 And the question is:  
 3 Yesterday, we were prohibited and  
 4 the witness was instructed to not  
 5 answer questions on communications  
 6 with trade organizations.  
 7 Is the DEA/DOJ going to  
 8 allow this question which is the  
 9 same type?  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I disagree  
 11 with your characterization of what  
 12 happened yesterday. You can ask  
 13 your questions and I will make my  
 14 objections, and counsel can ask  
 15 his questions and I will make my  
 16 objections.  
 17 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 18 Q. Would you please read the  
 19 highlighted section.  
 20 A. "However, I want to make it  
 21 clear that the submission of a monthly  
 22 printout of after-the-fact sales will not  
 23 relieve a registrant from the  
 24 responsibility of reporting excessive or

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 681

1 going to have more than time.  
 2 You're going to have days before  
 3 we reconvene for your redirect.  
 4 MR. STEPHENS: You  
 5 understand what I'm saying.  
 6 You're handing me things. I'm  
 7 doing the same to you. I've never  
 8 been in a situation where the  
 9 witness is being examined and I  
 10 don't have the document in front  
 11 of me.  
 12 MR. FARRELL: I'm putting  
 13 the document up on the screen as a  
 14 demonstrative point and then  
 15 asking the DEA to comment on it.  
 16 There is nothing that I have shown  
 17 anybody that is not in the record  
 18 and that hasn't been used in prior  
 19 testimony.  
 20 In fact, it's specifically  
 21 referenced in y'all's discovery  
 22 responses.  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: The 1970  
 24 hearings?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 680

1 suspicious orders. DEA has interpreted  
 2 orders to mean prior to shipment."  
 3 Q. Is this statement consistent  
 4 with the guidance the DEA has always  
 5 provided to registrants?  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 7 Form. Foundation. Scope.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 9 MR. FARRELL: This might be  
 10 a good break point if the DOJ  
 11 agrees.  
 12 MR. STEPHENS: Before we  
 13 break, Paul, just real quick, can  
 14 we please get a copy of the  
 15 presentation and the documents so  
 16 that we can review them  
 17 simultaneously while you're doing  
 18 this so we can handle our  
 19 redirect?  
 20 MR. FARRELL: Yes, yes.  
 21 MR. STEPHENS: Okay. If we  
 22 get them afterwards, then we're  
 23 going to need time to study them.  
 24 MR. FARRELL: Yeah, you're

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 682

1 MR. FARRELL: So at this  
 2 point in time -- at this point at  
 3 time, can we go off the record for  
 4 a break?  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Oh, I  
 6 thought we already were.  
 7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 2:04. We  
 8 are off the video record.  
 9 (Short break.)  
 10 MR. FARRELL: As one of the  
 11 co-leads for the plaintiffs' PEC  
 12 in the MDL litigation, I'll report  
 13 to you what David Cohen said.  
 14 Special Master Cohen  
 15 admonished us and reminded us of  
 16 his prior orders that we are to  
 17 eliminate speaking objections,  
 18 we're all to make sure that when  
 19 we state an objection, it's  
 20 concise.  
 21 He advised both plaintiffs  
 22 and defendants to make sure you  
 23 comply with it. He's not going to  
 24 tolerate speaking objections or

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 683

1 coaching of witnesses. We've  
 2 discussed this in other  
 3 depositions.  
 4 He also instructed that it's  
 5 not for us to be disputing or  
 6 debating the Touhy, that that's  
 7 for the government and for the  
 8 government to make the decisions.  
 9 And the discussion of  
 10 admissibility is for another day,  
 11 and that he expects us to conduct  
 12 ourselves like professionals and  
 13 move forward as best as we can.  
 14 And then on day three he's  
 15 volunteered to make himself  
 16 available.  
 17 Is there anything else that  
 18 anybody else would like to add?  
 19 MR. BENNETT: Yes, he also  
 20 made it very clear that there will  
 21 not be a fourth day.  
 22 MR. FARRELL: All right.  
 23 Now, what I would like to do is  
 24 I'm going to provide demonstrative

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 685

1 (Document marked for  
 2 identification as Exhibit  
 3 DEA-Prevoznik-P-1.)  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: So just to  
 5 be clear, you're handing these out  
 6 to us so that we have them.  
 7 MR. FARRELL: I'm having  
 8 this marked as an exhibit and then  
 9 the government can have it.  
 10 The second demonstrative  
 11 exhibit, Plaintiffs' 2 is the  
 12 United States USCCAN, U-S-C-C-A-N,  
 13 and it was referenced from the  
 14 congressional history.  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Are you  
 16 going to mark it?  
 17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: They want  
 18 video for this.  
 19 MR. FARRELL: Okay. We'll  
 20 start over.  
 21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 2:47. We  
 22 are on the video record.  
 23 MR. FARRELL: Can I have  
 24 that back, please.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 684

1 exhibits.  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: One more  
 3 thing. We did take issue from the  
 4 fact that we've been excluded from  
 5 many of the parties' conversations  
 6 with the court concerning  
 7 government witnesses and  
 8 government rights. We asked the  
 9 court formally, as we have in the  
 10 past, as we have asked the parties  
 11 many times in the past, to be  
 12 included in conversations with the  
 13 court, and the court unambiguously  
 14 required the parties to do so.  
 15 MR. FARRELL: Very good.  
 16 So the first set of  
 17 demonstrative exhibits are four  
 18 slides that I'll have marked as  
 19 Plaintiffs' 1. And it is the four  
 20 sections of the United States  
 21 code, including 801, 812, and 823.  
 22 These are the same slides that  
 23 were used in the McKesson 30(b)(6)  
 24 deposition.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 686

1 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1 is the  
 2 four slides that demonstrate the  
 3 United States Code 21 U.S.C. 801,  
 4 812, 821 and 823.  
 5 Plaintiffs' 2.  
 6 (Document marked for  
 7 identification as Exhibit  
 8 DEA-Prevoznik-P-2.)  
 9 MR. FARRELL: Is HR REP  
 10 Number 1444, 91st Congress.  
 11 Second session, 1970. This is the  
 12 congressional record from the  
 13 Controlled Substances Act. It's  
 14 the same document that was entered  
 15 in the McKesson 30(b)(6)  
 16 deposition.  
 17 (Document marked for  
 18 identification as Exhibit  
 19 DEA-Prevoznik-P-3.)  
 20 MR. FARRELL: Plaintiffs' 3  
 21 is from the HathiTrust, and it is  
 22 the drug abuse control amendments  
 23 from the 1970 hearings, 91st  
 24 Congress, second session. 900

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 687

1 pages of which we referenced only  
 2 a couple.  
 3 This is the first time that  
 4 was referenced in deposition as --  
 5 and in the MDL that I'm aware of.  
 6 (Document marked for  
 7 identification as Exhibit  
 8 DEA-Prevoznik-P-4.)  
 9 MR. FARRELL: Plaintiffs' 4  
 10 is -- we referenced Page 9 of the  
 11 Federal Register. Volume 36,  
 12 Number 80, from March 13, 1971.  
 13 MR. STEPHENS: This is  
 14 Number 4, Paul? Number 4?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: This is  
 16 Number 4.  
 17 MR. FARRELL: Number 5 was  
 18 the Federal Register from proposed  
 19 rulemaking from Saturday, March --  
 20 actually, that's -- this is  
 21 another copy. What was that  
 22 number? I'm sorry.  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: That was  
 24 4.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 689

1 21 C.F.R. 1301.74.  
 2 (Document marked for  
 3 identification as Exhibit  
 4 DEA-Prevoznik-P-7.)  
 5 MR. FARRELL: Plaintiffs' 7  
 6 is a document produced by Cardinal  
 7 Health in discovery and MDL2804.  
 8 It begins with Bates stamp  
 9 CAH\_MDL2804\_01465723, and it  
 10 extends all the way through  
 11 CAH\_MDL2804\_01465734.  
 12 It's Plaintiffs' Exhibit 7.  
 13 And I'll represent that it was  
 14 also in the government reliance  
 15 materials that they produced  
 16 yesterday at deposition.  
 17 That brings us up-to-date  
 18 for all of the demonstrative  
 19 exhibits that were used so far on  
 20 the record.  
 21 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: So should  
 23 we go off the record and bring the  
 24 witness back?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 688

1 MR. FARRELL: Did I make a  
 2 mistake? Sorry I got that  
 3 backwards.  
 4 Number 4 is from March 13,  
 5 1971. It's Volume 36, Number 50,  
 6 from the Federal Register.  
 7 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 5 is  
 8 from April 24, 1971, from the  
 9 Federal Register, Volume 36,  
 10 Number 80.  
 11 (Document marked for  
 12 identification as Exhibit  
 13 DEA-Prevoznik-P-5.)  
 14 MR. FARRELL: And we  
 15 referenced Paragraph 6 at the top  
 16 of the first page.  
 17 (Document marked for  
 18 identification as Exhibit  
 19 DEA-Prevoznik-P-6.)  
 20 MR. FARRELL: Plaintiffs' 6  
 21 is another slide that's been used  
 22 in the McKesson depositions of  
 23 Nate Hardie, 30(b)(6). And it's  
 24 simply a demonstrative exhibit of

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 690

1 MR. FARRELL: Yes.  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Yes.  
 3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 2:51. We  
 4 are off the video record.  
 5 (Brief pause.)  
 6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 2:55. We  
 7 are on the video record.  
 8 MR. FARRELL: More  
 9 housecleaning. Earlier today we  
 10 referenced -- more housecleaning.  
 11 Earlier we referenced a  
 12 position taken by Cardinal Health  
 13 in a pleading. It's United States  
 14 District Court for the -- United  
 15 States District Court for the  
 16 District of Columbia, Cardinal  
 17 Health versus Eric Holder, Case  
 18 Number 1:12-cv-00185-RBW.  
 19 It is Document 16 in the  
 20 pleading index, filed on  
 21 February 13, 2012. It's  
 22 previously been circulated, I'll  
 23 show it to you, even though it's  
 24 not being admitted through this

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 691

1 witness.  
 2 For the record that's the  
 3 document that I referenced.  
 4 (Document marked for  
 5 identification as Exhibit  
 6 DEA-Prevoznik-P-8.)  
 7 MR. FARRELL: Same thing  
 8 with earlier today, I referenced  
 9 what's being marked now -- that  
 10 was Plaintiff 8. This is going to  
 11 be Plaintiff 9.  
 12 (Document marked for  
 13 identification as Exhibit  
 14 DEA-Prevoznik-P-9.)  
 15 MR. FARRELL: And this is a  
 16 single page from a document with a  
 17 Bates stamp MCK MDL 00409239. And  
 18 again, this is a document that was  
 19 produced by McKesson in discovery  
 20 that I referenced and asked  
 21 questions about it with this  
 22 witness.  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Are you  
 24 going to provide me with copies?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 693

1 Q. On behalf of the DEA, do you  
 2 recognize this document?  
 3 A. Yes, I do.  
 4 Q. What is it?  
 5 A. It is part of our diversion  
 6 investigators manual.  
 7 Q. What does that mean?  
 8 What -- what is a diversion  
 9 investigators manual?  
 10 A. It's a manual that breaks  
 11 down our responsibilities, our job.  
 12 It -- it covers the whole gambit of what  
 13 registration is -- what a registrant is,  
 14 down to record reports, requirements. It  
 15 goes through our scheduled  
 16 investigations, pre-registration  
 17 investigations, how to -- conducting  
 18 audits when we do the scheduled  
 19 investigation, what topics, what areas to  
 20 cover.  
 21 It covers controlled  
 22 substances -- controlled substances. It  
 23 also covers the chemicals, List I  
 24 chemicals, the requirements of that, as

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 692

1 MR. FARRELL: Yes.  
 2 Did you get a copy of the  
 3 NWDA policy?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Thanks.  
 5 MR. FARRELL: That's  
 6 previously been made.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Just wait  
 8 for a question.  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, the next  
 11 document I'm going to reference is  
 12 actually in your notebook.  
 13 A. Okay.  
 14 Q. In the reliance materials  
 15 that you disclosed yesterday.  
 16 And it's the -- from the  
 17 1996 diversion investigators manual.  
 18 Section 5126.  
 19 MR. FARRELL: Bring it up on  
 20 the screen. And pass it down.  
 21 Here is some extra copies in  
 22 case people didn't bring their  
 23 notebooks back.  
 24 BY MR. FARRELL:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 694

1 well as preregistration investigations of  
 2 chemicals, applicants.  
 3 It covers the -- the gambit  
 4 of exactly what our job is.  
 5 Q. Are these -- in this page  
 6 that we're showing here, the bottom  
 7 right-hand corner is a Bates stamp. Can  
 8 you read that Bates stamp?  
 9 A. 00025231.  
 10 Q. Okay. Is this a document  
 11 produced by the DEA in this litigation at  
 12 the request of counsel for the diversion  
 13 investigators manual from 1996?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 15 We'll stipulate that we  
 16 produced it.  
 17 MR. FARRELL: Thank you.  
 18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 19 Q. So the title of Section 5126  
 20 says what?  
 21 A. Requirement to report  
 22 suspicious orders.  
 23 Q. Would you read the first  
 24 sentence of the first paragraph aloud?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 695

1 A. "Registrants are required to  
 2 inform DEA of suspicious orders in  
 3 accordance with 21 C.F.R. 1301.74(b).  
 4 DEA field offices are not to approve or  
 5 disapprove supplier shipments of  
 6 controlled substances. The  
 7 responsibility for making the decision to  
 8 ship rests with the supplier. No (sic)  
 9 exception to this occurs when a supplier  
 10 complies with a DEA field office's  
 11 request to initiate a controlled delivery  
 12 of controlled substances."  
 13 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 14 guidance provided by the DEA to  
 15 registrants?  
 16 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 18 MR. FARRELL: Now, if you'll  
 19 go down to -- keep going.  
 20 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 21 Q. Beginning with  
 22 "registrants," could you begin reading,  
 23 please.  
 24 A. "Registrants who routinely

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 697

1 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 2 form.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague as  
 4 to time.  
 5 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 6 Q. In 1996.  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. Are you aware of any  
 9 deviation or change from that position by  
 10 the DEA since 1996?  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 12 THE WITNESS: No.  
 13 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 14 Q. So the next sentence is just  
 15 a recitation of the suspicious order  
 16 definition. What I'd like you to do is  
 17 go down to where it starts, "The supplier  
 18 can determine," and begin reading aloud.  
 19 A. "The supplier can determine  
 20 whether the order is excessive by  
 21 checking their own sales and establishing  
 22 the average amount of controlled  
 23 substances shipped to registrants of the  
 24 same apparent size in a particular

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 696

1 report suspicious orders, yet fill these  
 2 orders, with reason to believe they are  
 3 destined for the illicit market, are  
 4 expressing an attitude of  
 5 irresponsibility that is detriment to the  
 6 public health and safety as set forth in  
 7 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824."  
 8 Q. Thank you. Is this  
 9 consistent with the guidance provided by  
 10 the DEA to registrants?  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 12 form.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 14 Form.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 17 Q. So this is the official  
 18 policy of the DEA as of 1996, agreed?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. Is this the position that  
 21 the DEA was instructing its diversion  
 22 investigators to take when looking into  
 23 cases involving the distribution of  
 24 controlled substances?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 698

1 geographic area."  
 2 Q. Read the next sentence,  
 3 please.  
 4 A. "If the customer exceeds  
 5 this threshold, the request should be  
 6 viewed as suspicious."  
 7 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 8 guidance that the DEA provided to  
 9 registrants since at least 1996?  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 11 form.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 13 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 14 Q. Is this the position that  
 15 the DEA -- strike that.  
 16 The reading of this seems to  
 17 indicate that if you exceed an average  
 18 amount, if a customer exceeds an average  
 19 amount -- let me start over.  
 20 This directive that DEA had  
 21 internally seems to indicate that it  
 22 considered that an order in excess of a  
 23 customer's average amount should be  
 24 deemed suspicious. Is that a fair

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 699

1 depiction?  
 2 A. Could you please --  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 4 form.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 6 please repeat that.  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. Yeah. When I read this, it  
 9 seems to indicate that a wholesale  
 10 distributor should watch the average  
 11 purchase by a customer over time, and if  
 12 that average is exceeded, it should be  
 13 deemed suspicious. Is that a fair  
 14 reading of this provision?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to  
 16 the characterization.  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Object to  
 18 form. Calls for a legal  
 19 conclusion.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Well, I think  
 21 it also includes that it has to  
 22 look at the other registrants in  
 23 that area. It's not just the  
 24 registrant that's ordering, but

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 701

1 Q. "This activity."  
 2 A. "This activity, over  
 3 extended periods of time, would lead a  
 4 reasonable person to believe that  
 5 controlled substances possibly are being  
 6 diverted.  
 7 Q. Now, so what I'm asking you  
 8 is, when you read this, is it fair to  
 9 assume that this is consistent with the  
 10 DEA's guidance to industry since at least  
 11 1996?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 13 Vague.  
 14 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 15 form.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 17 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 18 Q. Would you read the next  
 19 sentence, please.  
 20 A. "An investigation will be  
 21 conducted for possible violation of the  
 22 CSA and regulations upon determining that  
 23 the reporting registrant, as a general  
 24 practice, does not voluntarily halt

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 700

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 702

1 it's also comparing against the  
 2 other registrants in that area.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. So if you take an average of  
 5 the registrants in the area and you  
 6 calculate that, if a customer exceeds  
 7 that average, is that a red flag for a  
 8 wholesale distributor that the order may  
 9 be suspicious?  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 11 Calls for speculation. Objection  
 12 to form.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 15 Q. And is that consistent with  
 16 the directives the DEA has given to  
 17 registrants since at least 1996?  
 18 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 19 form.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. The next sentence, would you  
 23 read, please.  
 24 A. I forgot where I stopped.

1 shipments of controlled substances to  
 2 registrants involved in suspected  
 3 diversion or to registrants against whom  
 4 previous action has been taken."  
 5 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 6 guidance provided by the DEA to  
 7 registrants since at least 1996?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 10 form.  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. This last sentence that you  
 13 read contains a statement that "a  
 14 registrant shall not ship a suspicious  
 15 order." Is that a fair reading?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 18 form.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to  
 20 the form.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. Strike that. I'll ask it  
 23 again.  
 24 Based upon this 1996

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 703

1 document, was it the DEA's position that  
2 a registrant should halt shipments of  
3 controlled substances that are involved  
4 in suspected diversion?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. And does that include when a  
7 registrant has placed orders repeatedly  
8 in excess of the regional average?  
9 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
10 form.  
11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
12 form.  
13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
14 (Document marked for  
15 identification as Exhibit  
16 DEA-Prevoznik-P-10.)  
17 BY MR. FARRELL:  
18 Q. I'm going to have marked  
19 next Plaintiffs' Exhibit 10. And I'll  
20 show it to you and provide a copy to  
21 counsel and ask that you take a look at  
22 it, please.  
23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let me  
24 make sure that I get one of those.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 705

1 document is from whom?  
2 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
3 form. Foundation.  
4 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry,  
5 it -- it's Katherine Myrick. It's  
6 from Katherine Myrick, chiefs  
7 operations unit, our FOIA records  
8 management section.  
9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
10 Q. What is this document that  
11 you're looking at, do you recognize it?  
12 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
13 Form. Foundation.  
14 BY MR. FARRELL:  
15 Q. Not the attached document,  
16 the cover letter.  
17 MS. MAINIGI: Same  
18 objections.  
19 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I've --  
20 I've seen forms very similar to  
21 this.  
22 BY MR. FARRELL:  
23 Q. Okay. And so what does the  
24 DEA use this form for?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 704

1 MR. FARRELL: And for  
2 reference to counsel this is  
3 Bates-stamped  
4 CAH\_MDL2804\_02203353.  
5 BY MR. FARRELL:  
6 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, do you  
7 recognize this type of document?  
8 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
9 form.  
10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
12 Q. And what is it that you're  
13 looking at?  
14 A. A FOIA request.  
15 Q. And the FOIA request was  
16 sent by whom?  
17 A. Cardinal Health.  
18 Q. And to whom was it sent?  
19 A. Robert -- I don't know how  
20 to say his last name -- Giacalone.  
21 Q. All right. So let's back  
22 up.  
23 This is a request -- this  
24 isn't a request by Cardinal Health. The

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 706

1 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
2 Form. Foundation.  
3 THE WITNESS: To respond  
4 to --  
5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
6 THE WITNESS: To respond to  
7 FOIA requests.  
8 BY MR. FARRELL:  
9 Q. Okay. So you see where it  
10 says request number?  
11 A. Yes.  
12 Q. Okay. Does the DEA know  
13 what that number means or represents?  
14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
16 Scope. Foundation.  
17 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
19 Q. Okay. What does that number  
20 mean?  
21 MS. MAINIGI: Same  
22 objection.  
23 THE WITNESS: That is the  
24 number that is assigned to this

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 707

1 FOIA request when it comes in.  
2 BY MR. FARRELL:  
3 Q. Is there any particular  
4 significance of the first two letters  
5 being -- numbers being 03?  
6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
8 Q. To -- to the extent that you  
9 know as the Drug Enforcement Agency that  
10 wrote this document?  
11 A. It's the year.  
12 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
13 Scope. Foundation.  
14 BY MR. FARRELL:  
15 Q. So this is, to the DEA's  
16 best knowledge and information, a  
17 document that was generated in the year  
18 2003?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
22 Q. And it was generated by you,  
23 the DEA, and sent to Cardinal Health?  
24 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 709

1 BY MR. FARRELL:  
2 Q. Is it fair to reach the  
3 conclusion that the DEA disclosed to  
4 Cardinal Health in the year 2003  
5 Section 5126 of the 1996 diversion  
6 investigators manual?  
7 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
8 Scope. Foundation.  
9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
10 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
12 Q. The next document that I am  
13 going to reference, it was produced and  
14 circulated yesterday, but we have  
15 additional copies, is the 1998 Janet Reno  
16 report.  
17 (Document marked for  
18 identification as Exhibit  
19 DEA-Prevoznik-P-11.)  
20 BY MR. FARRELL:  
21 Q. I'm going to hand you what  
22 has been premarked as deposition  
23 plaintiff Exhibit 11. And have you take  
24 a look at it.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 708

1 Foundation. Scope.  
2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
3 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
4 BY MR. FARRELL:  
5 Q. And then when you look at  
6 the document that is attached, can you  
7 tell me what it -- that document is if  
8 you know?  
9 A. It's a section from our  
10 diversion investigators manual. And this  
11 is the cover sheet from our diversion  
12 investigators manual.  
13 Q. And what year is this  
14 diversion investigators manual?  
15 A. 1996, April 1996.  
16 Q. If you would take a moment,  
17 could you tell me whether or not this  
18 document that was produced by Cardinal is  
19 consistent with the diversion  
20 investigators manual that we just went  
21 over, produced by the federal government?  
22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
23 Form. Foundation.  
24 **THE WITNESS: Yes, it does.**

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 710

1 MR. FARRELL: Does anybody  
2 else need another copy from  
3 yesterday?  
4 It's the same one. It's  
5 Bates Stamp CAH\_HOUSE-002207. And  
6 it's double-Bates-stamped as  
7 CAH\_MDL\_PRIORPROD\_HOUSE\_0002207.  
8 Off the record.  
9 (Whereupon, a discussion was  
10 held off the record.)  
11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
12 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, do you  
13 recognize this document?  
14 A. Yes.  
15 Q. What is it?  
16 A. It's a report to the U.S.  
17 attorneys -- Attorney General. It's a  
18 report by the suspicious orders task  
19 force that was mandated to convene, and  
20 it's their report based on the  
21 Comprehensive Methamphetamine Control Act  
22 in 1996.  
23 Q. To the best of your  
24 knowledge, is this a true and accurate

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 711

1 copy of the report provided by the United  
 2 States Drug Enforcement Administration to  
 3 Attorney General Janet Reno?  
 4 A. To the best of my knowledge,  
 5 yes.  
 6 Q. What is the date of the  
 7 document?  
 8 A. October 1998.  
 9 Q. All right. Go to the next.  
 10 So I'm going to refer you to  
 11 page Bates stamp 2211. So this is in the  
 12 executive summary. And if you'll see the  
 13 second full sentence. There it is.  
 14 Can you tell me what the  
 15 implementation mandate was for this  
 16 report provided by the DEA to Attorney  
 17 General Janet Reno?  
 18 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 19 Foundation.  
 20 THE WITNESS: It was the  
 21 mandate that this task force  
 22 convene together and come up with  
 23 a report based on their  
 24 discussions.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 713

1 Did I read that accurately?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. Are you familiar with  
 4 21 U.S.C. 830(b)(1)(A)?  
 5 A. Can I look at it and refresh  
 6 my memory?  
 7 Q. You can. We have a -- I  
 8 believe we have a slide for you. And  
 9 it's also probably in -- in --  
 10 MR. FARRELL: You have it?  
 11 There we go.  
 12 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 13 Q. And I'm going to show you  
 14 the hardcopy of it and then we have  
 15 copies of this --  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: He has his  
 17 own copy.  
 18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 19 Q. Very good.  
 20 This provision that we're  
 21 looking at, and the distinction that I  
 22 want to make, what is the DEA's  
 23 understanding of the types of  
 24 transactions that should be reported as

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 712

1 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 2 Q. All right. So in general,  
 3 can you just, as the DEA, tell me, when  
 4 we reference this document, can we just  
 5 call it the Reno report?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Can you tell me in general,  
 8 do you -- does the DEA have an  
 9 understanding of what the purpose was of  
 10 this report that it generated for the  
 11 Attorney General?  
 12 A. It is our understanding that  
 13 this report was to discuss how to put a  
 14 suspicious ordering system forward to  
 15 handle the listed chemicals because of  
 16 the methamphetamine problem that we were  
 17 having in the United States.  
 18 Q. Now, this is also from the  
 19 executive summary. And it says that "the  
 20 charter required the establishment of a  
 21 task force to prepare recommendations  
 22 concerning additional guidelines to be  
 23 used by the chemical industry in  
 24 complying with 21 U.S.C. 830(b)(1)(A)."

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 714

1 suspicious pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 830?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 4 Form. Foundation. Scope.  
 5 THE WITNESS: To regulate  
 6 a -- regulated transactions, a  
 7 transaction for -- in this  
 8 particular section, regarding  
 9 chemicals.  
 10 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. So we are talking about  
 12 List I chemicals, not controlled  
 13 substances?  
 14 A. Correct.  
 15 Q. And when we are talking  
 16 about methamphetamine, what we are  
 17 specifically talking about are regulated  
 18 chemicals the DEA refers to as List I,  
 19 which include ephedrine and  
 20 pseudoephedrine?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 24 form.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 715

1 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 2 Q. I promise I'll get there in  
 3 a second.  
 4 **So under this report, it's**  
 5 **my understanding, is that the DEA was**  
 6 **complying with Section 21 U.S.C. 830,**  
 7 **which, if you read Paragraph 1(a) out**  
 8 **loud, requires what? Reports to the**  
 9 **Attorney General. It says, "Each**  
 10 **regulated person shall report to the**  
 11 **Attorney General." And what does A say?**  
 12 MR. STEPHENS: Object to  
 13 form.  
 14 THE WITNESS: "Any regulated  
 15 transaction involving an  
 16 extraordinary quantity of a listed  
 17 chemical, an uncommon method of  
 18 payment or delivery, or any other  
 19 circumstance that the regulated  
 20 person believes may indicate that  
 21 the listed chemical will be used  
 22 in violation of this subchapter."  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. So, I'm asking the DEA, the

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 717

1 A. Yeah. I'm waiting to make  
 2 sure --  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 4 Scope and foundation.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 6 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. What size transaction should  
 9 registrants look for when they're looking  
 10 for suspicious orders of controlled  
 11 substances?  
 12 A. Unusual -- excessive.  
 13 Excessive.  
 14 Q. And a definition of  
 15 suspicious order in the regulation, is  
 16 unusual what?  
 17 A. Unusual quantity.  
 18 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 19 form.  
 20 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 21 Q. Unusual size --  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 23 form.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Unusual size,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 716

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 718

1 Reno report from 1998, its authority  
 2 arises out of the Methamphetamine Act; is  
 3 that right?  
 4 MR. STEPHENS: Object to  
 5 form.  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 7 Scope.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 9 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
 10 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. And the definition of a  
 12 suspicious order under the  
 13 Methamphetamine Act is what? What size  
 14 transaction?  
 15 A. The extraordinary quantity.  
 16 Q. All right. Now, controlled  
 17 substances are not governed by the  
 18 methamphetamine act unless they contain  
 19 ephedrine or pseudoephedrine; is that  
 20 right?  
 21 MR. STEPHENS: Object to  
 22 form.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. I'm asking you, the DEA?

1 patterns deviating from a  
 2 normal -- can I refresh my memory  
 3 just looking at it?  
 4 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 5 Q. Go ahead, yeah. You see  
 6 where I'm going with this. I'm trying to  
 7 figure out the difference and whether  
 8 there's a difference between the  
 9 definition of a suspicious order, if it  
 10 contains a List I chemical versus the  
 11 definition of suspicious order if it's a  
 12 controlled substance.  
 13 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 14 Coaching the witness. Objection  
 15 to form.  
 16 THE WITNESS: So suspicious  
 17 orders for controlled substances  
 18 include orders of unusual size,  
 19 orders deviating substantially  
 20 from a normal pattern, and orders  
 21 of unusual frequency.  
 22 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 23 Q. So from the DEA's  
 24 perspective, what is bigger? Unusual or

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 719

1 extraordinary?  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 3 Scope. Objection. Form.  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 5 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I object  
 7 to the scope. You can answer.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat  
 9 it?  
 10 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. Yeah. From the DEA's  
 12 perspective and guidance that it provides  
 13 to industry, what is larger, an order  
 14 that's unusual, or an order that's  
 15 extraordinary?  
 16 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 17 Scope, form, foundation.  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 19 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope,  
 21 calls for a legal conclusion.  
 22 THE WITNESS: I believe it's  
 23 going to be dependent on the  
 24 product too. So it's not -- it's

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 721

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 2 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to  
 4 the form.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Can you please  
 6 repeat it.  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. Yeah, I'm trying to get  
 9 there. I'm trying to establish --  
 10 because has the DEA ever told any  
 11 distributor of prescription opioids that  
 12 it can use the definition of suspicious  
 13 order from the Methamphetamine Act?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 15 form. Foundation.  
 16 THE WITNESS: The term --  
 17 the term that you used, "ever,"  
 18 that's all encompassing. So I  
 19 don't know that I can -- I cannot  
 20 testify that no one has ever said  
 21 that.  
 22 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 23 Q. So what I'm going to refer  
 24 back to is this.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 720

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 722

1 not just on size or extraordinary.  
 2 It's varying criteria. It could  
 3 be other criteria. So is it a  
 4 chemical? Is it a controlled  
 5 substance? What schedule is it  
 6 in? That kind of thing.  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. Because it -- comparing a  
 9 List I chemical to a controlled  
 10 substance, is comparing apples to  
 11 oranges; is that fair?  
 12 MR. STEPHENS: Object to  
 13 form.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 16 Vague.  
 17 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 18 Q. Okay. So when you're trying  
 19 to apply -- if you're selling an  
 20 extraordinary quantity of opioids, is  
 21 that more than, equal to, or less than  
 22 unusual sizes?  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 24 Scope. Objection.

1 Let's go to Page 2247 of the  
 2 Reno report. This was discussed at  
 3 length yesterday. Do you recall this,  
 4 Exhibit 2?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. Okay. So the first thing I  
 7 want you to -- so the first thing that  
 8 we're going to do is we're going to look  
 9 at where it says "Note: Factor equals  
 10 three."  
 11 Okay. So this was discussed  
 12 yesterday. I'm just trying to find  
 13 clarification.  
 14 This Reno report, according  
 15 to this note, applies to List I  
 16 chemicals, agreed?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Sorry.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 22 Foundation.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. Second -- secondly, it can

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 723

1 apply to Control II and Control III  
 2 controlled substances that contain List I  
 3 chemicals. Agreed or disagree?  
 4 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 5 Scope. Foundation.  
 6 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection to  
 7 form.  
 8 **THE WITNESS: Agreed.**  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. And it applies to Control  
 11 III. And what does that mean N-V? "N-V  
 12 controlled substances and noncontrolled  
 13 over-the-counter products containing  
 14 List I chemical items."  
 15 Do you know what that means?  
 16 A. Looking at it, I would be  
 17 speculating what it means.  
 18 Based on what I know, that  
 19 looks like III-N, would be III,  
 20 non-narcotic.  
 21 Q. So more directly, has the  
 22 DEA ever provided -- I keep using that  
 23 word "ever."  
 24 Has the DEA -- does the DEA

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 725

1 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
 2 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. There was a suggestion made  
 4 by some of defense counsel yesterday  
 5 during your examination that it also  
 6 applies to controlled substances.  
 7 And so what I would like you  
 8 to do is take a look at the note and tell  
 9 me whether or not that note indicates,  
 10 pursuant to the DEA's understanding,  
 11 whether or not this applies to all  
 12 controlled substances, or just controlled  
 13 substances that contain List I chemicals  
 14 or some other interpretation that I'm  
 15 missing?  
 16 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 17 Form.  
 18 Objection. Coaching the  
 19 witness.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I object  
 21 to the scope.  
 22 But you can answer in your  
 23 personal capacity, if you know.  
 24 **THE WITNESS: Yes, I agree.**

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 724

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 726

1 believe that this algorithm is  
 2 appropriate for measuring as a metric  
 3 suspicious orders of controlled  
 4 substances that do not include List I  
 5 chemicals?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 8 Scope.  
 9 **THE WITNESS: Can you please**  
 10 **repeat that.**  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 **Q. Yes. We agree that this**  
 13 **document we're looking at from the Reno**  
 14 **report is guidance from the DEA to**  
 15 **registrants under the Methamphetamine Act**  
 16 **regarding looking for orders of**  
 17 **extraordinary size involving List I**  
 18 **chemicals. That's been established. And**  
 19 **I'm asking you whether or not you agree**  
 20 **with it.**  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 23 form.  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Objection.

1 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 2 Q. So the DEA agrees that this  
 3 applies only to List I chemicals and  
 4 controlled substances that contain List I  
 5 chemicals, agreed?  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Hang on.  
 7 My instruction was you could ask  
 8 Tom Prevoznik if he agrees,  
 9 because this is not within the  
 10 scope of his authorization.  
 11 MS. SINGER: Though it does  
 12 relate to guidance the DEA  
 13 provided to registrants. That is  
 14 the context in which defendants  
 15 offered it yesterday.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I  
 17 understand the defendants  
 18 offered -- offered it yesterday.  
 19 And I made the same objections  
 20 there.  
 21 This is about chemicals. We  
 22 are talking about controlled  
 23 substances. You can answer in  
 24 your personal capacity.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 727

1 MR. FARRELL: Well, I -- I  
 2 don't -- respectfully don't need  
 3 his personal capacity. I need the  
 4 DEA's position on whether or not  
 5 the Reno report is --  
 6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. Let me ask you this. Let me  
 8 ask you in a different way.  
 9 Has the DEA ever provided  
 10 guidance to a registrant that it is  
 11 appropriate in the context of controlled  
 12 substances, which do not include List I  
 13 chemicals, to define suspicious orders as  
 14 orders of extraordinary quantity?  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 16 Foundation.  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 18 Form.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Again, you  
 20 used the word ever. I can't -- I  
 21 don't know if that's never not  
 22 happened.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. That's -- that's fair.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 729

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 4 Foundation.  
 5 MR. FARRELL: You're right.  
 6 This is -- is she back yet?  
 7 Do we have the Cardinal  
 8 Health documents yet?  
 9 Let's take a quick break if  
 10 you don't mind.  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay. I'd  
 12 like this to be our last break.  
 13 And we're going to break for the  
 14 day at 5.  
 15 MR. FARRELL: Yeah.  
 16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 3:35. We  
 17 are off the video record.  
 18 (Short break.)  
 19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 3:49. We  
 20 are on the video record.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. I'm going to try to go at  
 23 this through a different route.  
 24 I'm going to show you what

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 728

1 Speaking on behalf of the  
 2 DEA, do you believe that the Reno report  
 3 is an appropriate standard to measure  
 4 suspicious orders of controlled  
 5 substances that do not contain List I  
 6 chemicals?  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 8 Scope. Foundation.  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Form.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Please repeat  
 11 that.  
 12 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 13 Q. Has the DEA provided  
 14 guidance to registrants that it can  
 15 monitor suspicious orders of List I  
 16 chemicals using the Reno report?  
 17 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 18 Q. I forgot what I asked you.  
 19 (Whereupon, the court  
 20 reporter read back the requested  
 21 portion of testimony.)  
 22 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 23 Q. What is the purpose of the  
 24 Reno report?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 730

1 has been premarked as Plaintiffs'  
 2 Exhibit 12 to your deposition.  
 3 (Document marked for  
 4 identification as Exhibit  
 5 DEA-Prevoznik-P-12.)  
 6 MR. FARRELL: I have copies,  
 7 four copies for counsel. I have a  
 8 copy for the DOJ. And a copy for  
 9 you.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Thank you.  
 11 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. And I'll represent to you  
 13 that this is not a document that you've  
 14 seen before.  
 15 But this is Cardinal  
 16 Health's Third Supplemental Objections  
 17 and Responses to Plaintiffs' First  
 18 Combined Discovery Requests served in  
 19 this litigation.  
 20 And I -- I'll give you a  
 21 moment to get oriented with it. But  
 22 eventually I'm going to be directing your  
 23 attention to Page 12.  
 24 Now, specifically what I'm

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 731

1 going to reference you to on Page 12 is  
 2 the last paragraph.  
 3 And it -- and Cardinal  
 4 Health says, "From at least 1995 through  
 5 late 2007, Cardinal Health understood DEA  
 6 to want suspicious orders reported to the  
 7 administration in the form of ingredient  
 8 limit reports."  
 9 Do you see that?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 12 form.  
 13 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 14 Q. My question to you as the  
 15 representative from the DEA, is, has the  
 16 DEA ever provided guidance to Cardinal  
 17 Health that it could -- that it could  
 18 report suspicious orders through the use  
 19 of ingredient limit reports?  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 21 Scope. Objection. Form.  
 22 Objection. Foundation.  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I join the  
 24 scope objection to the extent that

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 733

1 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 2 Coaching the witness.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. And so the next sentence,  
 5 could you read it aloud?  
 6 A. "Based on guidance from the  
 7 DEA, see example,  
 8 CAH\_MDL\_PRIORPROD\_HOUSE\_0002207 --  
 9 Q. Stop right there for a  
 10 second. Do you recognize that Bates  
 11 stamp number?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. Where do you recognize that  
 14 Bates stamp number from?  
 15 A. The Reno report.  
 16 Q. The exhibit that we just  
 17 went over?  
 18 A. That we referred -- yes,  
 19 right.  
 20 Q. So this is Cardinal Health  
 21 representing in this litigation that it  
 22 understood that it was based on guidance  
 23 from the DEA using that Reno report.  
 24 My question to you is, is

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 732

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 734

1 it calls for guidance outside of  
 2 the distributor initiative.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. You can answer.  
 5 A. I'm just reading -- can I --  
 6 Q. Absolutely.  
 7 A. Again, I'm just getting  
 8 familiar with it.  
 9 Please repeat the question.  
 10 Q. Yeah, what I'll do is I'll  
 11 start over.  
 12 The very first sentence,  
 13 you'll see Cardinal Health represents  
 14 from at least '95 through 2007, Cardinal  
 15 Health understood DEA to want suspicious  
 16 orders reported to the administration in  
 17 the form of ingredient limit reports.  
 18 Do you see that sentence?  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 20 form.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. That's exactly what it says,  
 23 correct?  
 24 A. Yes.

1 the DEA ever aware of providing such  
 2 guidance to Cardinal Health?  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 4 Form. Objection. Scope.  
 5 Objection. Coaching the witness.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Again, the use  
 7 of ever, I don't -- I don't -- I  
 8 don't know.  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. Do you have any knowledge of  
 11 providing such guidance to Cardinal  
 12 Health?  
 13 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 14 Asked and answered. Objection.  
 15 Form. Scope.  
 16 THE WITNESS: I am not  
 17 aware.  
 18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 19 Q. Will you continue reading?  
 20 A. "Cardinal Health understood  
 21 DEA to want orders for opioids reported  
 22 that exceeded a calculation endorsed by  
 23 DEA or that a wholesale distributor  
 24 otherwise identified as unusual in size,

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 735

1 pattern or frequency."

2 Q. Are you aware of the DEA

3 ever endorsing a calculation for opioids

4 to identify orders of unusual size,

5 pattern, or frequency?

6 A. No.

7 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

8 Form. Objection. Scope.

9 BY MR. FARRELL:

10 Q. Is it appropriate and

11 compliant with federal law for a

12 registrant to use the Reno report as the

13 methodology in which it measures

14 suspicious orders of opioids that do not

15 contain List I chemicals?

16 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

17 Calls for a legal conclusion.

18 Form.

19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.

20 THE WITNESS: Well, the

21 statute requires the registrant to

22 design and operate the system.

23 BY MR. FARRELL:

24 Q. Let's be clear about which

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 737

1 Q. It's one of the exhibits.

2 Try 1310.05.

3 A. .05 and what section? A-1.

4 Q. A-1.

5 A. "Extraordinary quantity of a

6 listed chemical, an uncommon method of

7 payment or delivery, or any other

8 circumstance that the regulated person

9 believes may indicate that the listed

10 chemical will be used in violation of

11 this part."

12 Q. So my question to the DEA,

13 is, did the DEA ever provide guidance to

14 Cardinal Health that it could use the

15 Reno report's definition of suspicious,

16 which is extraordinary size, as the

17 algorithm for measuring unusual orders of

18 controlled substances?

19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

20 Scope, form.

21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.

22 THE WITNESS: Not to my

23 knowledge.

24 BY MR. FARRELL:

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 736

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 738

1 statute we are talking about.

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. Which one are you reading

4 from?

5 A. I'm reading from the C.F.R.

6 Q. For List I chemicals?

7 A. Controlled substances.

8 Q. Controlled substances. And

9 how does it define suspicious orders?

10 A. Again, "Suspicious orders

11 include orders of unusual size, orders

12 deviating substantially from a normal

13 pattern, or" -- "and orders of unusual

14 frequency."

15 Q. Now, I'd like you to flip to

16 List I chemicals. What is the DEA's rule

17 on looking for suspicious orders of

18 List I chemicals?

19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

20 Scope. Form.

21 BY MR. FARRELL:

22 Q. Do you have the C.F.R. or

23 the --

24 A. C.F.R.

1 Q. This is Cardinal Health in

2 its pleading in this litigation, telling

3 the court that the DEA endorsed it to use

4 the Reno report to monitor suspicious

5 orders of controlled substances,

6 including opioids. Is that statement

7 true or not true?

8 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

9 Form. Coaching witness. Scope.

10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.

11 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat

12 the question?

13 BY MR. FARRELL:

14 Q. Cardinal Health is stating

15 in its discovery responses to the court

16 that the DEA provided guidance to them,

17 that they could use the Reno report and

18 its algorithm for orders of extraordinary

19 size to identify unusual orders of

20 controlled substances.

21 Are you aware of the DEA

22 providing such guidance to Cardinal

23 Health?

24 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 739

1 Form. Coaching the witness.  
 2 Scope.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 4 THE WITNESS: I am not  
 5 aware.  
 6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. Is it the DEA's position  
 8 that using an algorithm for extraordinary  
 9 size is an appropriate measurement of  
 10 orders of unusual size for controlled  
 11 substances?  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 13 Form.  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 15 Scope.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Form.  
 17 THE WITNESS: No.  
 18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 19 Q. In fact, in the Reno report,  
 20 the DEA provided recommendation and  
 21 guidance to registrants that it could  
 22 look for orders of extraordinary size of  
 23 List I chemicals using a factor of three.  
 24 Is that correct?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 741

1 Paragraph 1, is this the guidance that  
 2 the DEA was providing to registrants as  
 3 the current calculation being used to  
 4 look for orders of extraordinary size of  
 5 List I chemicals?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 7 Foundation.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. So there appear to be five  
 12 steps that DEA was providing guidance  
 13 for, agreed?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 15 Foundation. Form.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 17 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 18 Q. And will you read paragraph  
 19 Step 1?  
 20 A. "Add purchase quantities for  
 21 the last 12 months for all customers  
 22 within same distribution center and for  
 23 customer type (hospital, pharmacy or  
 24 other) for any List I chemical-containing

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 740

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 742

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Objection  
 3 scope.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. Would it be appropriate for  
 8 a registrant to use a factor of four to  
 9 look for orders of unusual size of  
 10 controlled substances?  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 12 Foundation. Objection. Scope.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 14 hypothetical.  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 16 Form.  
 17 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
 18 I don't know what factor three,  
 19 factor four -- factor -- I don't  
 20 know what those factors are.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. Okay. So let's go and look  
 23 at page -- on the Reno report,  
 24 Bates-stamped 2247. So if you look at

1 item stocked by the distribution center."  
 2 Q. So in Step 1, it appears  
 3 that the guidance the DEA is providing is  
 4 for a registrant to add the purchase  
 5 quantities for the last 12 months by a  
 6 customer of List I chemicals within the  
 7 same distribution center for the same  
 8 customer type, agreed?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 11 Scope.  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 13 Form. Foundation.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 16 Q. And then on Number 2, it  
 17 says, "Add customer months for every  
 18 record used in above total."  
 19 Did I read that accurately?  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 21 Form and foundation.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. Step 3 is to divide that

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 743

1 total quantity by the total customer  
 2 months.  
 3 Did I read that accurately?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Objection form  
 5 and foundation.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. Very good. Now, once we do  
 9 this math -- it's not so fuzzy -- what it  
 10 gives us, is it gives us the average  
 11 purchases by a customer per month for the  
 12 past year, agreed?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Agreed.  
 16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 17 Q. And then under Paragraph 4,  
 18 it says multiply that by a factor. And  
 19 that gives us the maximum amount that the  
 20 customer can order per month before  
 21 showing up on a suspicious order report.  
 22 Do you see that?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. So again, this is for List I

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 745

1 factor should be for three, for  
 2 Control II and Control III controlled  
 3 substances containing List I chemicals."  
 4 Do you see that?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 7 form.  
 8 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 9 Q. Now, if it's just a pure  
 10 List I chemical, and it doesn't  
 11 contain -- I'm sorry, the other way  
 12 around.  
 13 If you take the factor of  
 14 three for List I chemicals, it gives you  
 15 the maximum amount before a suspicious  
 16 order is triggered. That's the factor  
 17 the DEA is recommending registrants use  
 18 for List I chemicals.  
 19 Agreed?  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Agreed.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. Okay. So my question to you

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 744

1 chemicals arising out of methamphetamine  
 2 act and the guidance provided by the DEA  
 3 to Attorney General Janet Reno, and the  
 4 recommendation is that when you're  
 5 looking for orders of extraordinary size  
 6 of List I chemicals, ephedrine,  
 7 pseudoephedrine, a registrant should look  
 8 for like-size groups of customers from a  
 9 distribution facility, add up the total  
 10 by base weight over the past 12 months,  
 11 divide it by 12, and multiply it by a  
 12 factor. Agreed?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 14 form.  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 16 form. Mischaracterizes the  
 17 report.  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 19 Foundation.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 21 You can answer.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Agreed.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. It says here, "The" -- "The

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 746

1 is, is it appropriate to use this  
 2 standard for controlled substances that  
 3 don't include List I chemicals?  
 4 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 5 Form. Foundation.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Can I get  
 7 the question back?  
 8 I'm sorry, because my  
 9 realtime -- can you ask it again?  
 10 (Whereupon, the court  
 11 reporter read back the requested  
 12 portion of testimony.)  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay. You  
 14 can answer.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat  
 16 it?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Can you  
 18 repeat it?  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. By using this methodology,  
 21 you are providing guidance to registrants  
 22 to identify extraordinary orders of  
 23 List I chemicals by using a multiplier of  
 24 three times the monthly average for a

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 747

1 similar customer.  
 2 Is that fair?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 4 form.  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 6 Form. Foundation.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 8 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 9 Q. Has the DEA provided  
 10 guidance to registrants of controlled  
 11 substances that don't include List I  
 12 chemicals that it can multiply the  
 13 monthly average by three to identify  
 14 orders that are merely unusual?  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 16 Foundation. Form.  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 18 Scope.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 20 knowledge.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. So if you're using a  
 23 measuring stick that the DEA has  
 24 provided --

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 749

1 question isn't about industrywide  
 2 guidance. I join the scope  
 3 objection.  
 4 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 5 Q. Let me try it again then.  
 6 Has the DEA ever provided  
 7 industrywide guidance that it could use  
 8 the definition of suspicious order for  
 9 the List I chemicals under the  
 10 methamphetamine act for orders of  
 11 controlled substances that do not include  
 12 List I chemicals?  
 13 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 14 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 15 form.  
 16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 17 Q. So now let's go back to  
 18 Cardinal's combined discovery requests.  
 19 Page 12.  
 20 In the context of the first  
 21 sentence, has the DEA ever provided  
 22 guidance to registrants, which are, in  
 23 this case, distributors of Control II  
 24 prescription opioids, that it satisfies

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 748

1 MS. MAINIGI: May I ask for  
 2 clarification, Counsel? Is that  
 3 to your personal knowledge?  
 4 MR. FARRELL: Enu, you --  
 5 you can have redirect. He's  
 6 testifying in his official  
 7 capacity, so --  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'll say  
 9 he's here to testify about  
 10 industrywide guidance, and I took  
 11 the question in that spirit.  
 12 And you can ask -- you can  
 13 ask your next question.  
 14 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 15 Q. So if -- if a registrant is  
 16 making -- are you aware of ever making --  
 17 providing guidance to a registrant that  
 18 it could use the Reno report as an  
 19 effective tool to monitor suspicious  
 20 orders of controlled substances that  
 21 don't include List I chemicals?  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 23 Form. Foundation. Scope.  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: That

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 750

1 its compliance obligations under federal  
 2 law by submitting after-the-fact  
 3 ingredient limit reports?  
 4 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 5 Form. Objection. Foundation.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 8 knowledge.  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. Now, you'll recall from the  
 11 1996 diversion investigators manual, if  
 12 you'll flip back to it, which is  
 13 Exhibit 11.  
 14 A. I'll use mine. The '96 one?  
 15 Q. The '96 one.  
 16 Is there any reference to  
 17 an -- an approved factor to be used by a  
 18 registrant to identify unusual orders of  
 19 controlled substances?  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Objection --  
 21 excuse me. Objection to form.  
 22 THE WITNESS: No.  
 23 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. If a registrant used a

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 751

1 factor to increase -- that's a bad  
2 question.  
3 Are you aware of the DEA  
4 ever endorsing the use of a factor to use  
5 in the calculation of unusual orders of  
6 controlled substances that do not include  
7 List I chemicals?  
8 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
9 form.  
10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
11 THE WITNESS: Again, it's  
12 the use of the word ever.  
13 I am not -- I am not aware,  
14 but I have concerns of the word of  
15 the use ever.  
16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
17 Q. Is a registrant that uses  
18 the factor when calculating orders of  
19 unusual size of controlled substances  
20 that do not include List I chemicals,  
21 compliant with federal regulations?  
22 MR. STEPHENS: Object to  
23 form.  
24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 753

1 knowledge.  
2 BY MR. FARRELL:  
3 Q. Now, in -- in other places  
4 I'll represent to you that some  
5 registrants of controlled substances that  
6 do not include List I chemicals are  
7 relying upon the chemical handlers  
8 manual. That fact will be established in  
9 the record.  
10 So my question to you first  
11 is, are you familiar with the DEA's  
12 chemical handlers manual?  
13 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
14 Coaching the witness. Objection  
15 to form.  
16 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
17 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
19 Q. I'm going to show you what's  
20 going to be marked as?  
21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: 13.  
22 MR. FARRELL: So what did  
23 you say?  
24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: 13. I

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 752

1 a legal conclusion.  
2 MS. MAINIGI: Join.  
3 THE WITNESS: Could you  
4 please repeat it?  
5 BY MR. FARRELL:  
6 Q. Would the DEA ever endorse a  
7 methodology for use by a registrant that  
8 multiplied a monthly average by four to  
9 determine orders of unusual size?  
10 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
11 Foundation.  
12 MS. MAINIGI: Calls for  
13 speculation.  
14 THE WITNESS: DEA doesn't  
15 endorse the systems.  
16 BY MR. FARRELL:  
17 Q. Is using a factor of four  
18 when calculating orders of unusual size  
19 compliant with federal regulations  
20 according to the DEA?  
21 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
22 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
23 Form.  
24 THE WITNESS: Not to my

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 754

1 think it's 13.  
2 (Document marked for  
3 identification as Exhibit  
4 DEA-Prevoznik-P-13.)  
5 BY MR. FARRELL:  
6 Q. 13? Plaintiffs' 13. And it  
7 is Bates stamped  
8 CAH\_MDL\_PRIORPROD\_DEA07\_01198690.  
9 I'll hand that to you.  
10 MR. FARRELL: I've got  
11 insufficient number of copies.  
12 Bonnie will be e-mailing it around  
13 as well.  
14 BY MR. FARRELL:  
15 Q. I'll give you a moment to  
16 review it. And my first question is  
17 going to be is whether or not you  
18 recognize this document.  
19 A. Yes, I recognize it.  
20 Q. What is it?  
21 A. It's a manual that we put  
22 together for those that are handling  
23 List I chemicals.  
24 Q. Is it publicly available?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 755

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. And is this a true and  
 3 accurate version of the 2004 chemical  
 4 handler's manual published by the DEA?  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.

6 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 7 form.

8 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**

9 **BY MR. FARRELL:**

10 Q. Again, is this a document  
 11 that applies to List I chemicals,  
 12 including ephedrine and pseudoephedrine  
 13 and the chemicals used to make  
 14 methamphetamine?

15 A. Yes.

16 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 17 form.

18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.

19 **BY MR. FARRELL:**

20 Q. Does the DEA provide  
 21 guidance that this document is an  
 22 appropriate reference point for  
 23 monitoring suspicious orders of  
 24 controlled substances that do not include

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 757

1 for illicit purposes, good practice  
 2 requires that every reasonable effort be  
 3 made to resolve those suspicions. In  
 4 addition to making the required reports,  
 5 the transaction should not be completed  
 6 until the customer is able to eliminate  
 7 the suspicions. The distributor may have  
 8 to forego some transactions. When DEA  
 9 reviews distributors' decisions, minor  
 10 events are not cause for government  
 11 action.  
 12 "At the same time, a  
 13 regulated person who fails to implement a  
 14 system to prevent diversion will be  
 15 closely scrutinized and, if warranted,  
 16 may be subject to civil, administrative,  
 17 or criminal penalties."  
 18 Q. So with regard to List I  
 19 chemicals that a registrant determines  
 20 that are suspicious, what guidance has  
 21 the DEA provided on whether or not the  
 22 order should be shipped?  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 24 Scope. Foundation.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 756

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 758

1 List I chemicals?  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 4 form.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 6 **THE WITNESS: No.**  
 7 **BY MR. FARRELL:**  
 8 Q. Now, I'm going to have you  
 9 flip to Bates stamp 01198713 which is  
 10 Page 19. I'm going to have you go down  
 11 and look first at the third full  
 12 paragraph.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: "When a  
 14 regulated person suspects"?

15 MR. FARRELL: Yes, sir.

16 **BY MR. FARRELL:**

17 Q. At the top of the page,  
 18 you'll see it says, "Recognizing  
 19 suspicious orders." And then I'm going  
 20 to ask you to read the first -- read the  
 21 paragraph that begins, "When a regulated  
 22 person."

23 A. "When a regulated person  
 24 suspects that an order may be intended

1 **THE WITNESS: That they**  
 2 should not do it.  
 3 **BY MR. FARRELL:**  
 4 Q. So is this consistent with  
 5 the guidance that the DEA provided to  
 6 registrants of controlled substances that  
 7 do not include List I chemicals?  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 9 Vague. Timing.  
 10 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
 11 **BY MR. FARRELL:**  
 12 Q. Now, you'll see directly  
 13 above that, there's a reference to  
 14 Exhibit E. So I'm going to have you flip  
 15 to Page 41, which is Bates-stamped  
 16 01198735.  
 17 Now, if you look at the top  
 18 left-hand corner there's an appendix  
 19 number, Appendix E-3.  
 20 A. I see that.  
 21 Q. And when you read the  
 22 language of Appendix E-3, does this track  
 23 the language from the Reno report?  
 24 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 759

1 Scope, form, foundation.  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 4 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 5 Q. So if a registrant of --  
 6 that is a wholesale distributor of  
 7 controlled substances that do not include  
 8 List I chemicals is using E-3 to identify  
 9 suspicious orders of unusual size,  
 10 frequency, or pattern, is that compliant  
 11 with federal law?  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 13 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 14 Form.  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 16 a legal conclusion.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Please repeat.  
 18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 19 Q. If a registrant that is a  
 20 wholesale distributor of controlled  
 21 substances, excluding those that contain  
 22 List I chemicals, is using E-3 to  
 23 identify suspicious orders of unusual  
 24 size, frequency or pattern, is that

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 761

1 to take a look at. And tell me if you  
 2 recognize this document.  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. What is it?  
 5 A. It's a letter that DEA sent  
 6 to the distributors, registrants, by  
 7 Joe -- by Joe Rannazzisi who was the head  
 8 of the diversion program of DEA, it's  
 9 dated September 27th, 2006.  
 10 Q. Is this a true and accurate  
 11 copy of the letter sent by the DEA to all  
 12 registrants in the chain of distribution  
 13 of controlled substances?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. Can you verify and validate  
 16 that this letter was sent to every  
 17 wholesale distributor and manufacturer  
 18 that sells or distributes controlled  
 19 substances and are registered with the  
 20 DEA?  
 21 MR. STEPHENS: Object to  
 22 form.  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 24 Objection. Foundation.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 760

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 762

1 compliant with federal law, according to  
 2 the DEA?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 4 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 5 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 6 Form.  
 7 THE WITNESS: No.  
 8 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 9 Q. So I'm going to make this  
 10 easier. I'm going to mark as the next  
 11 sequential exhibit, which is Plaintiffs'  
 12 Exhibit --  
 13 A. Oh, right, 14.  
 14 Q. I'm terrible at exhibit  
 15 numbers.  
 16 (Document marked for  
 17 identification as Exhibit  
 18 DEA-Prevoznik-P-14.)  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. And to make it easier for  
 21 everybody, this is from the DEA reliance  
 22 materials that were circulated yesterday.  
 23 This is the DEA's letter dated  
 24 September 27th, 2006, that I'll ask you

1 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection to  
 2 form.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 4 THE WITNESS: There were  
 5 actually two mailings of this.  
 6 This was one, and then there was  
 7 one in February. So it did go out  
 8 to all of them.  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. So did they go out to all --  
 11 let me back up.  
 12 What was the purpose of the  
 13 February letter?  
 14 A. It was the same. It was the  
 15 same letter, but to make sure that all  
 16 the wholesalers got it.  
 17 Q. So the same letter was sent  
 18 twice?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. And to the DEA's knowledge,  
 21 was there a shortcoming on the first  
 22 distribution of the letter, or why did  
 23 you send it out a second time?  
 24 MS. MAINIGI: Object to

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 763

1 form.  
 2 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. But you know it was sent out  
 5 twice?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Can you validate and affirm  
 8 that the DEA sent this letter to every  
 9 wholesale distributor of prescription  
 10 opioids that are registered with the DEA?  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 12 Scope, form, foundation.  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection to  
 14 form.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Back at this  
 16 time?  
 17 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 18 Q. Yes.  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. What about to manufacturers?  
 21 A. This did not go to the  
 22 manufacturers.  
 23 Q. Just to the distributors?  
 24 A. Correct.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 765

1 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 2 Q. Do you recognize this  
 3 document?  
 4 A. It's the same one that you  
 5 just gave me.  
 6 Q. I meant to give you the 2006  
 7 version.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You did  
 9 give him the 2006 version.  
 10 MR. FARRELL: I just did it  
 11 again with 2006, huh?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Correct.  
 13 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 14 Q. Previously been marked as  
 15 Exhibit 5 in yesterday's deposition. And  
 16 I'm going to try to find a clean copy.  
 17 Now, I'm going to ask you the same  
 18 question.  
 19 Is this a true and accurate  
 20 copy of the second Rannazzisi letter sent  
 21 by the DEA to wholesale distributors of  
 22 prescription opioids dated December 27,  
 23 2007?  
 24 A. It went to manufacturers and

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 764

1 Q. So without belaboring the  
 2 point in going through this, is it the  
 3 DEA's position that anything in that  
 4 letter is a new rule?  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 6 Form.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 8 THE WITNESS: No.  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. I'm going to ask you the  
 11 same questions. I'm going to have  
 12 marked -- the 2007 letter that's in my  
 13 book from reliance materials is just one  
 14 page.  
 15 So I'm going to have marked  
 16 as the next sequential exhibit, which is  
 17 Plaintiff's 15.  
 18 (Document marked for  
 19 identification as Exhibit  
 20 DEA-Prevoznik-P-15.)  
 21 MR. FARRELL: Document  
 22 bearing Bates stamp  
 23 US-DEA-00022459. And I'm going to  
 24 hand it to you.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 766

1 distributors.  
 2 Q. This one did?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. Is -- is this a true and  
 5 accurate copy of that letter?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Does the DEA believe that  
 8 there's anything in this letter that  
 9 constitutes a new rule?  
 10 A. No.  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 12 form.  
 13 MR. FARRELL: Bear with me  
 14 for a second, please.  
 15 All right. So the next  
 16 thing that I'm going to show you  
 17 is the testimony from Cardinal  
 18 Health's 30(b)(6) deponent. And  
 19 then after we show you the video  
 20 clip I'm going to ask you a  
 21 question.  
 22 Go ahead and play Norris.  
 23 (Video clip played as  
 24 follows:)

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 767

1 NORRIS: This letter sets  
 2 forth the obligations --  
 3 (Video stopped.)  
 4 MR. FARRELL: Can you stop  
 5 it. Start it.  
 6 I'm sorry, we had a little  
 7 technical gaffe.  
 8 (Video clip played as  
 9 follows:)  
 10 MR. FARRELL: So as of  
 11 September 27, 2006, you  
 12 acknowledge that this letter sets  
 13 forth the obligations under the  
 14 Controlled Substances Act and  
 15 under the code of federal  
 16 regulations for Cardinal Health?  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 18 Scope. Objection. Form.  
 19 THE WITNESS: As to the  
 20 reiteration of the reporting  
 21 requirement, yes.  
 22 Again, the shipping  
 23 requirement, to use short form,  
 24 was a new -- new idea to Cardinal

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 769

1 the direction we received from the  
 2 DEA. We made the reports as  
 3 required and there was not a  
 4 shipping requirement.  
 5 (Video concluded.)  
 6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. So my question to you is, is  
 8 did the DEA ever provide such instruction  
 9 to a registrant?  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: Outside --  
 11 objection. Outside the scope.  
 12 Objection. Form.  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 14 Foundation.  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Could you  
 17 please repeat it?  
 18 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 19 Q. Did the DEA ever provide  
 20 guidance to a registrant that it could  
 21 report a suspicious order and then still  
 22 ship it?  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 24 Scope. Objection. Form and

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 768

1 Health at the time they received  
 2 this letter. So it was not -- I  
 3 do not agree that that was an  
 4 obligation in the statute going  
 5 back."  
 6 (Video concluded.)  
 7 MR. FARRELL: Play the next  
 8 one, please.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Is there a  
 10 question, Mr. Farrell?  
 11 Just an ongoing objection to  
 12 just playing video from Cardinal  
 13 Health's 30(b)(6).  
 14 (Video clip played as  
 15 follows:)  
 16 MR. FARRELL: During this  
 17 time frame prior to 2007, did  
 18 Cardinal report orders as  
 19 potentially suspicious or  
 20 suspicious orders, and then still  
 21 send the shipments out?  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 23 Time period.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Yes, that is

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 770

1 foundation.  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Scope.  
 3 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. All right. So let me repeat  
 5 it.  
 6 **Cardinal Health claims that**  
 7 **it received direction from the DEA that**  
 8 **it could report suspicious orders and**  
 9 **then still ship it.**  
 10 **Is the DEA aware of**  
 11 **providing such guidance?**  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 13 Scope. Objection. Form.  
 14 Objection. Misstates Cardinal  
 15 Health testimony. Vague as to  
 16 time.  
 17 **THE WITNESS: Not to my**  
 18 **knowledge.**  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. Does the DEA take the  
 21 position that a registrant of controlled  
 22 substances has a duty to block shipment  
 23 of suspicious orders of controlled  
 24 substances?

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 771

1 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 2 Form. Objection. Vague as to  
 3 time.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Can you please  
 5 repeat it?  
 6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. Does the DEA take the  
 8 position that a registrant of controlled  
 9 substances has a duty to block shipments  
 10 of suspicious orders?  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 12 Form. Objection. Vague as to  
 13 time.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 16 Q. Is that now and always been  
 17 the law in the United States of America?  
 18 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 19 Form. Outside the scope.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. And if a registrant says  
 23 that it was allowed to ship suspicious  
 24 orders, is that -- has that ever been

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 773

1 identification as Exhibit  
 2 DEA-Prevoznik-P-16.)  
 3 MR. FARRELL: And for  
 4 everybody's reference, I'm -- I'm  
 5 referring to the Novelty  
 6 Distributors, Inc., revocation of  
 7 registration, Federal Register  
 8 Volume 73, Number 176, dated  
 9 September 10, 2008.  
 10 I believe it was referenced  
 11 yesterday at some point in time.  
 12 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 13 Q. Do you recognize the form of  
 14 this document?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. What is it?  
 17 A. It's a Federal Register of  
 18 notice.  
 19 Q. And what is the date of it?  
 20 A. Wednesday, September 10,  
 21 2008.  
 22 Q. Is this a publication that  
 23 is available to the general public?  
 24 A. Yes.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 772

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 774

1 blessed by the DEA?  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 3 Form. Objection. Scope.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 6 Hypothetical.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Please repeat  
 8 it.  
 9 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. Okay. You saw the testimony  
 11 from Cardinal Health.  
 12 Do you believe the testimony  
 13 is accurate?  
 14 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 15 Form. Objection. Scope.  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 17 Vague.  
 18 THE WITNESS: No.  
 19 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. I apologize, I don't have --  
 21 I've got a copy for you. And I've got  
 22 a -- that I'll mark as Plaintiffs'  
 23 Exhibit 16.  
 24 (Document marked for

1 Q. Is this a true and accurate  
 2 copy of the revocation of registration of  
 3 a wholesale distributor published by the  
 4 Drug Enforcement Agency?  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 6 Scope.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Join the  
 8 scope objection.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. I'm going to direct your  
 12 attention now to Bates -- or the page  
 13 Number 52699. In the top right-hand  
 14 corner. In the middle paragraph of the  
 15 middle column. And I'd ask you to read  
 16 aloud the highlighted section.  
 17 A. "Fundamental to its  
 18 obligation to maintain effective controls  
 19 against diversion, a distributor must  
 20 review every order and identify  
 21 suspicious transactions. Further, it  
 22 must do so prior to shipping the  
 23 products. Indeed, a distributor has an  
 24 affirmative duty to forgo a transaction

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 775

1 if, upon investigation, it is unable to  
 2 determine that the proposed transaction  
 3 is for legitimate purposes. See DEA  
 4 chemical handler's manual 21.  
 5 "Respondents procedure of  
 6 post-transaction review is incompatible  
 7 with its obligation to identify and  
 8 forego suspicious transactions."  
 9 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 10 guidance the DEA provided to registrants?  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 12 Vague as to time period and scope.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 15 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 16 2006 and 2007 letters sent by the DEA,  
 17 authored by Joe Rannazzisi, to  
 18 registrants that are involved in the  
 19 closed system of controlled substances?  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 21 form.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I object  
 23 to the pronunciation of his name.  
 24 But you can answer.

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 777

1 final point.  
 2 I think I'm going to ask for  
 3 relief to continue the deposition  
 4 until we get back together again.  
 5 Ten till 5:00.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 7 MR. FARRELL: With your  
 8 permission, we'll adjourn until  
 9 Day 3.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Well, we  
 11 will certainly adjourn. I  
 12 understand the parties are going  
 13 to demand a Day 3.  
 14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 4:50. We  
 15 are off the video record.  
 16 (Excused.)  
 17 (Deposition adjourned at  
 18 approximately 4:50 p.m.)  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 776

1 THE WITNESS: I would  
 2 clarify that it went to -- the  
 3 first one went to distributors.  
 4 And the 2007 went to manufacturers  
 5 and distributors. So yes.  
 6 BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. Now, go to the very next  
 8 portion. I'm going to reference a  
 9 footnote.  
 10 A. Same page?  
 11 Q. No. It is 52702. It's  
 12 Footnote 52, I believe.  
 13 A. Okay. I see it.  
 14 Q. And over on the very last  
 15 thing, it says, "Moreover, field  
 16 personnel may approve the renewal of a  
 17 registration" --  
 18 Wait a minute.  
 19 It says -- can I see my copy  
 20 back real quick?  
 21 MR. FARRELL: You can take  
 22 that down for a second. I  
 23 apologize. We're running out of  
 24 clock, but I want to get to one

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 778

1  
 2 CERTIFICATE  
 3  
 4  
 5 I HEREBY CERTIFY that the witness was duly sworn by me  
 6 and that the deposition is a true record of the testimony given by the  
 7 witness.  
 8 It was requested before  
 9 completion of the deposition that the witness, THOMAS  
 10 PREVOZNIK, have the  
 11 opportunity to read and sign the deposition transcript.  
 12 \_\_\_\_\_ MICHELLE L.  
 13 A. Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Shorthand  
 14 Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and Notary Public  
 15 Dated: April 22, 2019  
 16  
 17  
 18 (The foregoing certification  
 19 of this transcript does not apply to any  
 20 reproduction of the same by any means,  
 21 unless under the direct control and/or  
 22 supervision of the certifying reporter.)  
 23

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 779

1 INSTRUCTIONS TO WITNESS  
 2  
 3 Please read your deposition  
 4 over carefully and make any necessary  
 5 corrections. You should state the reason  
 6 in the appropriate space on the errata  
 7 sheet for any corrections that are made.  
 8 After doing so, please sign  
 9 the errata sheet and date it.  
 10 You are signing same subject  
 11 to the changes you have noted on the  
 12 errata sheet, which will be attached to  
 13 your deposition.  
 14 It is imperative that you  
 15 return the original errata sheet to the  
 16 deposing attorney within thirty (30) days  
 17 of receipt of the deposition transcript  
 18 by you. If you fail to do so, the  
 19 deposition transcript may be deemed to be  
 20 accurate and may be used in court.  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 781

1  
 2 ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT  
 3  
 4 I, \_\_\_\_\_, do  
 5 hereby certify that I have read the  
 6 foregoing pages, 410 - 782, and that the  
 7 same is a correct transcription of the  
 8 answers given by me to the questions  
 9 therein propounded, except for the  
 10 corrections or changes in form or  
 11 substance, if any, noted in the attached  
 12 Errata Sheet.  
 13  
 14  
 15 \_\_\_\_\_  
 16 THOMAS PREVOZNIK DATE  
 17  
 18  
 19 Subscribed and sworn to before me this  
 20 \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.  
 21 My commission expires: \_\_\_\_\_  
 22 \_\_\_\_\_  
 23 Notary Public  
 24

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 780

1 - - - - - ERRATA  
 2 - - - - -  
 3  
 4 PAGE LINE CHANGE  
 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 6 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_  
 7 \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 \_\_\_\_\_  
 10 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_  
 11 \_\_\_\_\_  
 12 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_  
 13 \_\_\_\_\_  
 14 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_  
 15 \_\_\_\_\_  
 16 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_  
 17 \_\_\_\_\_  
 18 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_  
 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
 20 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_  
 21 \_\_\_\_\_  
 22 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_  
 23 \_\_\_\_\_  
 24 REASON: \_\_\_\_\_

04-18-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 782

1 LAWYER'S NOTES  
 2 PAGE LINE  
 3 \_\_\_\_\_  
 4 \_\_\_\_\_  
 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 6 \_\_\_\_\_  
 7 \_\_\_\_\_  
 8 \_\_\_\_\_  
 9 \_\_\_\_\_  
 10 \_\_\_\_\_  
 11 \_\_\_\_\_  
 12 \_\_\_\_\_  
 13 \_\_\_\_\_  
 14 \_\_\_\_\_  
 15 \_\_\_\_\_  
 16 \_\_\_\_\_  
 17 \_\_\_\_\_  
 18 \_\_\_\_\_  
 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
 20 \_\_\_\_\_  
 21 \_\_\_\_\_  
 22 \_\_\_\_\_  
 23 \_\_\_\_\_  
 24 \_\_\_\_\_

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 783

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN  
 2 DISTRICT OF OHIO  
 3 EASTERN DIVISION  
 4 IN RE: NATIONAL )  
 5 PRESCRIPTION ) MDL No. 2804 OPIATE LITIGATION )  
 6 ) Case No. ) 1:17-MD-2804  
 7 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES ) Hon. Dan A.  
 8 TO ALL CASES ) Polster  
 9 FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2019  
 10 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL SUBJECT TO FURTHER  
 11 CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW  
 12  
 13 Videotaped deposition of Thomas  
 14 Prevoznik, Volume III, held at the offices of  
 15 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP, 725 Twelfth Street,  
 16 NW, Washington, DC, commencing at 8:10 a.m.,  
 17 on the above date, before Carrie A. Campbell,  
 18 Registered Diplomate Reporter and Certified  
 19 Realtime Reporter.  
 20  
 21  
 22 GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES  
 23 877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax deps@golkow.com  
 24

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 785

1 LEVIN PAPANTONIO THOMAS MITCHELL RAFFERTY  
 2 PROCTOR, P.A.  
 3 BY: PAGE POERSCHKE ppoerschke@levinlaw.com  
 4 (VIA REALTIME STREAM) 316 South Baylen Street  
 5 Pensacola, Florida 32502 (850) 435-7000  
 6 Counsel for Plaintiffs  
 7  
 8 NAPOLI SHKOLNIK, PLLC BY: HUNTER J. SHKOLNIK  
 9 hunter@napolilaw.com (VIA TELECONFERENCE)  
 10 360 Lexington Avenue, 11th Floor New York, New York  
 11 10017  
 12 (212) 397-1000 Counsel for Cuyahoga County  
 13  
 14 BRANSTETTER STRANCH & JENNINGS, PLLC  
 15 BY: JOE P. LENISKI, JR. joeyl@bsjfirm.com  
 16 223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200 Nashville, Tennessee  
 17 37203  
 18 (615) 254-8801 Counsel for the Tennessee Action  
 19  
 20 US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
 21 BY: DAVID FINKELSTEIN david.m.finkelstein@usdoj.gov  
 22 NATALIE A. WAITES natalie.a.waites@usdoj.gov  
 23 175 N Street, NE, Room 10-2222 Washington, DC 20002  
 24 (202) 616-2964  
 25 and  
 26  
 27  
 28

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 784

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 786

1 A. P P E A R A N C E S :  
 2  
 3 GREENE, KETCHUM, FARRELL, BAILEY & TWEEL LLP  
 4 BY: PAUL T. FARRELL, JR. paul@greeneketchum.com  
 5 419 Eleventh Street Huntington, West Virginia 25701  
 6 (314) 525-9115  
 7  
 8 MOTLEY RICE LLC BY: LINDA SINGER  
 9 lsinger@motleyrice.com SARA D. AGUINIGA  
 10 sanguiniga@motleyrice.com AMANDA UNTERREINER  
 11 aunterreiner@motleyrice.com (VIA REALTIME STREAM)  
 12 401 Ninth Street NW, Suite 1001 Washington, DC 20004  
 13 (202) 232-5504  
 14  
 15 MCHUGH FULLER LAW GROUP BY: MICHAEL J. FULLER,  
 16 JR.  
 17 mike@mchughfuller.com 97 Elias Whiddon Road  
 18 Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39402 (601) 261-2220  
 19  
 20 THE DUGAN LAW FIRM  
 21 BY: BONNIE A. KENDRICK bonnie@dugan-lawfirm.com  
 22 One Canal Place 365 Canal Place, Suite 1000  
 23 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 (504) 648-0180  
 24

1 US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BY: JAMES R. BENNETT,  
 2 II  
 3 james.bennett4@usdoj.gov United States Courthouse  
 4 801 West Superior Avenue, Suite 400 Cleveland, Ohio 44113  
 5 (216) 622-3988  
 6 and  
 7 US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BY: MARIAMA C. SPEARS  
 8 mariama.c.spears@usdoj.gov 8701 Morrisette Drive  
 9 Springfield, Virginia 22152 (202) 598-6204  
 10 Representing the US DOJ and the Witness  
 11  
 12 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP BY: ENU MAINIGI  
 13 emainigi@wc.com COLLEEN McNAMARA  
 14 cmcnamara@wc.com BRAD MASTERS  
 15 bmasters@wc.com 725 Twelfth Street, N.W.  
 16 Washington, DC 20005 (202) 434-5331  
 17 Counsel for Cardinal Health, Inc.  
 18  
 19 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP BY: CHRISTOPHER K.  
 20 EPPICH  
 21 ceppich@cov.com 1999 Avenue of the Stars  
 22 Los Angeles, California 90067 (424) 332-4764  
 23 and  
 24

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 787

1 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP BY: ANDREW STANNER  
 2 astanner@cov.com KEVIN M. KELLY  
 3 kkelly@cov.com 850 Tenth Street, NW  
 4 Washington, DC 20001-4956 (202) 662-6000  
 5 Counsel for McKesson Corporation  
 6  
 7 REED SMITH LLP BY: ROBERT A. NICHOLAS  
 8 rnicholas@reedsmith.com JOSEPH J. MAHADY  
 9 jmahady@reedsmith.com SHANNON MCCLURE  
 10 smclure@reedsmith.com (VIA REALTIME STREAM)  
 11 ABIGAIL PIERCE abigail.pierce@reedsmith.com  
 12 (VIA REALTIME STREAM) ANNE E. ROLLINS  
 13 arollins@reedsmith.com (VIA REALTIME STREAM)  
 14 Three Logan Square 1717 Arch Street, Suite 3100  
 15 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 (215) 851-8100  
 16 Counsel for AmerisourceBergen  
 17  
 18 BARTLIT BECK LLP  
 19 BY: LESTER C. HOUTZ lester.houtz@bartlit-beck.com  
 20 1801 Wewatta Street, Suite 1200 Denver, Colorado 80202  
 21 (303) 592-3100  
 22 and  
 23  
 24  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 789

1 MARCUS & SHAPIRA LLP BY: JOSHUA A. KOBIN  
 2 kobrin@Marcus-Shapira.com 301 Grant Street, 35th Floor  
 3 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-6401 (412) 338-4690  
 4 Counsel for HBC  
 5  
 6 DECHERT LLP BY: MELANIE MACKAY  
 7 melanie.mackay@dechert.com 35 West Wacker Drive, Suite 3400  
 8 Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 646-5800  
 9 Counsel for Purdue Pharma  
 10  
 11 BARNES & THORNBURG LLP BY: WILLIAM E. PADGETT  
 12 william.padgett@btlaw.com 11 South Meridian Street  
 13 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 (317) 236-1313  
 14 Counsel for HD Smith  
 15  
 16 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP BY: JOHN P. LAVELLE, JR.  
 17 john.lavelle@morganlewis.com 1701 Market Street  
 18 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2921 (215) 963-5000  
 19 Counsel for Rite Aid  
 20  
 21 KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP BY: KAITLYN COVERSTONE  
 22 kaitlyn.coverstone@kirkland.com 300 North LaSalle Street  
 23 Chicago, Illinois 60654 (312) 862-7184  
 24 Counsel for Allergan Finance, LLC

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 788

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 790

1 BARTLIT BECK LLP  
 2 BY: KATHERINE SWIFT kswift@bartlit-beck.com  
 (VIA REALTIME STREAM) 54 West Hubbard Street, Suite 300  
 4 Chicago, Illinois 60654 (312) 494-4400  
 5 Counsel for Walgreens  
 6  
 7 JONES DAY BY: TARA A. FUMERTON  
 8 tfumerton@jonesday.com PATRICK J. BEISELL  
 9 pbeisell@jonesday.com (VIA REALTIME STREAM)  
 10 77 West Wacker Chicago, Illinois 60601-1692  
 11 (312) 782-3939 Counsel for Walmart  
 12  
 13 ZUCKERMAN SPAEDER LLP  
 14 BY: ANTHONY M. RUIZ aruiz@zuckerman.com  
 15 1800 M Street NW, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20036-5807  
 16 (202) 778-1800 Counsel for CVS Indiana, LLC, and  
 17 CVS RX Services, Inc.  
 18  
 19 ROPES & GRAY LLP BY: ANDREW O'CONNOR  
 20 andrew.o'connor@ropesgray.com JOSHUA E. GOLDSTEIN  
 21 joshua.goldstein@ropesgray.com 800 Boylston Street  
 22 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-3600 (617) 951-7000  
 23 Counsel for Mallinckrodt  
 24

1 FOLEY & LARDNER, LLP BY: KRISTINA J. MATIC  
 2 kmatic@foley.com 777 East Wisconsin Avenue  
 3 Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202 (414) 297-5913  
 4 Counsel for Actavis Laboratories UT, Inc., Actavis Pharma, Inc., ANDA, Inc., and Actavis, Inc., (N/k/a Allergan Finance, LLC, Watson Laboratories, Inc.  
 7  
 8 LOCKE LORD LLP BY: MADELEINE E. BRUNNER  
 9 maddie.brunner@lockelord.com (VIA TELECONFERENCE)  
 10 SARAH LANCASTER (VIA REALTIME STREAM)  
 11 2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800 Dallas, Texas 75201  
 12 (214) 740-8445 Counsel for Henry Schein, Inc., and  
 13 Henry Schein Medical Systems, Inc.  
 14  
 15 FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP BY: STEPHAN CORNELL  
 16 Scornell@foxrothschild.com (VIA TELECONFERENCE)  
 17 2700 Kelly Road, Suite 300 Warrington, Pennsylvania 18976-3624  
 18 (215) 918-3615 Counsel for Prescription Supply, Inc.  
 19  
 20 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
 21 BY: RYAN SNYDER rsnyder@omm.com  
 (VIA TELECONFERENCE) 1999 Avenue of the Stars, 8th Floor  
 23 Los Angeles, California 90067 (213) 430-6326

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 791

1 ALSO PRESENT:  
 2 SPECIAL MASTER DAVID R. COHEN  
 3 david@specialmaster.law  
 3 24400 Chagrin Boulevard, Suite 300 Cleveland, Ohio 44122  
 4 (216) 831-0001  
 5 JENNA N. FORSTER, paralegal, Motley  
 6 Rice  
 7 KAITLYN EEKHOFF, paralegal, Motley Rice (VIA REALTIME  
 STREAM)  
 8  
 9 VIDEOGRAPHER:  
 10 DAN LAWLOR, Golkow Litigation Services  
 11  
 12 TRIAL TECHNICIAN:  
 13 JAMES BELL, Golkow Litigation Services  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 793

1 Prevoznik P20 December 8, 1993 letter, 816 Excessive  
 Purchase Reports,  
 2 Phillip E. Jordan and Gene R. Haislip,  
 3 US-DEA-00026154 - US-DEA-00026155  
 4 Prevoznik P21 Federal Register, Volume 62, 828  
 5 Number 233, Wednesday, November 19, 1997, Notices,  
 6 US-DEA-00025302  
 7 Prevoznik July 23, 1998 letter from 1070 Defendant 22  
 Patricia M. Good to Bergen  
 8 Brunswig Corporation, US-DEA-00025671  
 9 Prevoznik P22 August 16, 2005 DEA 834  
 10 Memorandum on Internet Presentation with  
 11 AmerisourceBergen on August 10, 2005,  
 12 US-DEA-00000147 - US-DEA-00000164  
 13 Prevoznik Bergen Brunswig Corporation 1079  
 Defendant 23 September 30, 1996 letter to Mr. G. Thomas  
 Gitchel,  
 15 ABDCMDL00269355 - ABDCMDL00269358  
 16 Prevoznik P23 August 23, 2005 DEA 834  
 17 Memorandum on Meeting with Cardinal Health, Inc.,  
 18 Concerning Internet Pharmacies,  
 19 US-DEA-00000352 - US-DEA-00000366  
 20 Prevoznik P24 December 6, 2005 DEA 834  
 21 Memorandum on Conference Call with Mr. John Gilbert,  
 22 US-DEA-00000369 - US-DEA-00000370  
 23 Prevoznik Not Marked  
 24 Defendant 24

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 792

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 794

1 INDEX  
 2 PAGE  
 3 APPEARANCES..... 784  
 4 EXAMINATIONS  
 5 BY MR. FARRELL..... 801  
 6 BY MS. SINGER..... 861  
 7 BY MR. MAHADY..... 1060  
 8 BY MS. FUMERTON..... 1169  
 9 BY MR. O'CONNOR..... 1187  
 10 BY MR. EPPICH..... 1201  
 11 BY MS. MAINIGI..... 1203  
 12  
 13 EXHIBITS  
 14 No. Description Page  
 Prevoznik P17 Seminar Report Controlled 800 Substances  
 Manufacturers and  
 Wholesalers Seminar, San Antonio, Texas, April 7-9,  
 1987, US-DEA-00025656 -  
 18 US-DEA-00025659  
 Prevoznik P18 NWDA Suspicious Order 806 Monitoring  
 Systems,  
 20 US-DEA-00026139 - US-DEA-00026150  
 21 Prevoznik P19 December 27, 1988 letter 811  
 22 from Ronald W. Buzzeo to Walgreen Company,  
 23 US-DEA-00025683  
 24

1 Prevoznik December 30, 1997 letter 1122 Defendant 25  
 from Bergen Brunswig  
 2 Corporation to Mr. G. Thomas Gitchel,  
 3 ABDCMDL00269350 - ABDCMDL00269351  
 4 Prevoznik P25 January 23, 2006 DEA 834  
 5 Memorandum on Meeting Between Office of Diversion  
 6 Control (OD) and McKesson Corp. On January 3, 2006,  
 7 US-DEA-00000371 - US-DEA-00000373  
 8 Prevoznik October 29, 1996 Letter to 1102  
 9 Defendant 26 Bergen Brunswig Corporation from Mr. G.  
 Thomas Gitchel,  
 10 US-DEA-00025673 - US-DEA-00025673  
 11 Prevoznik P26 January 14, 2008 letter to 850  
 12 Larry Cote from Jodi Avergun,  
 13 CAH\_MDL2804\_01376788 - CAH\_MDL2804\_01376809  
 14 Prevoznik January 14, 2004 letter from 1140  
 15 Defendant 27 John R. McCarty to Mr. Steve Mays,  
 16 ABDCMDL00315827  
 17 Prevoznik P27 January 23, 2008 letter from 856 Ronald  
 W. Buzzeo to Jodi  
 18 Avergun, CAH\_MDL2804\_03309960 -  
 19 CAH\_MDL2804\_03309971  
 20 Prevoznik AmerisourceBergen Memorandum 1144  
 Defendant 28 dated October 25, 2004,  
 21 Subject ABC Awarded DEA Certificate of Appreciation,  
 22 ABDCMDL00315829 - ABDCMDL00315861  
 23

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 795

1 Prevoznik US DOJ DEA Diversion Control 1158 Defendant  
 29 Pharmaceutical Industry  
 2 Conference, September 11 & 12, 2007 - Houston, Texas  
 3 printout  
 4 Prevoznik P29 NWDA Suspicious Order 862 Monitoring  
 System timeline  
 5 Prevoznik DEA Pharmaceutical Industry 1160  
 Defendant 30 Conference, Wholesale Distribution,  
 Diversion  
 7 Control Program, September 11, 2007,  
 8 ABDCMDL00037184 - ABDCMDL00037205  
 9 Prevoznik P30 Not Marked  
 10 P31 and P32  
 11 Prevoznik P33 DEA Diversion Investigators Manual,  
 866  
 12 CAH\_MDL\_PRIORPROD\_DEA07\_ 01176247 -  
 13 CAH\_MDL\_PRIORPROD\_DEA07\_ 01176558  
 14 Prevoznik P34 5126 Requirement to Report 871  
 15 Suspicious Orders, 96-2 Diversion Investigators  
 16 Manual 04/16/96  
 17 Prevoznik P35 Controlled Substances 874 Manual,  
 National Wholesale  
 18 Druggists' Association, HDA\_MDL\_000219360 -  
 19 HDA\_MDL\_000219632  
 20 Prevoznik P36 NWDA Develops DEA Compliance 875  
 Institute to Reduce Industry  
 21 Exposure to Fines  
 22 Prevoznik P37 DEA Compliance Manual, 885 Cardinal  
 Health,  
 23 CAH\_MDL\_PRIORPROD\_DEA07\_ 01178834 -

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 797

1 Prevoznik P45 Draft Options for Controlled 958  
 Substance Regulatory and  
 2 Related Activity for Review Purpose Only - Not for  
 3 External Circulation, CAH\_MDL2804\_01530082 -  
 4 CAH\_MDL2804\_01530084  
 Prevoznik P46 E&C, Red Flags and Warning 963 Signs  
 Ignored: Opioid  
 6 Distribution and Enforcement Concerns in West Virginia,  
 7 Prepared by the Energy and Commerce Committee, Majority  
 8 Staff, PPLP0300001799742  
 9 Prevoznik P47 DEA/OD 11th Pharmaceutical 981  
 10 Industry Conference, Risk Management of Pharmaceutical  
 11 Controlled Substances, Tuesday, September 16, New  
 12 Orleans, Louisiana, PPLP0300001799742  
 13 Prevoznik P48 Office of Chief Counsel, DEA 986  
 14 PowerPoint, CAH\_MDL2804\_00889528 -  
 15 CAH\_MDL2804\_00889540  
 16 Prevoznik P49 15th Annual Controlled 993 Substance,  
 PDMA and State  
 17 Conference, It's What You Know and Who You Know, D.  
 18 Linden Barber, April 19, 2012,  
 A n d a \_ O p i o i d s \_ M D L \_ 0 0 0 0 4 7 6 0 5 2 -  
 19 Anda\_Opioids\_MDL\_0000476080  
 20 Prevoznik P50 Slide on Dr. Syed Jawed 1000  
 21 Akhtar-Zaidi - Solon, OH  
 22 Prevoznik P51 Slide on Dr. Adolph Harper - 1002 Akron,  
 OH  
 23

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 796

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 798

1 Prevoznik P38 Transcript of Videotaped 893 Deposition of  
 Thomas  
 2 Prevoznik, April 17, 2019  
 3 Prevoznik P39 Industry Compliance 899 Guidelines,  
 HDMA Industry  
 4 Compliance Guidelines: Reporting Suspicious Orders  
 and Preventing Diversion of Controlled Substances,  
 6 CAH\_MDL2804\_00988458 - CAH\_MDL2804\_00988472  
 7 Prevoznik P40 Draft DEA Comments from the 923  
 8 6-04-08 Meeting on Suspicious Orders,  
 9 CAH\_MDL2804\_03234535 - CAH\_MDL2804\_03234540  
 10 Prevoznik P41 US DEA September 27, 2006 935  
 11 letter from Joseph T. Rannazzisi,  
 12 MNK-Ti\_0000421086 - MNK-Ti\_0000421089  
 13 Prevoznik P42 "American Pain: The largest 948  
 14 U.S. Pill Mill's Rise and Fall," Felix Gillette, June  
 15 6, 2012  
 16 Prevoznik P43 Re: Report on House Energy & 951  
 Commerce Subcommittee on DEA  
 17 and FDA Transparency, MCKMDL0066143 -  
 18 MCKMDL0066145  
 19 Prevoznik P44 Summary of DEA-HDMA Meeting 955 (Dec.  
 19, 201) By the  
 20 Healthcare Distribution Management Association,  
 21 Confidential, ABDCMDL00139028 -  
 22 ABDCMDL00139031  
 23

1 Prevoznik P52 United States of America vs. 1002 Adolph  
 Harper, Jr.,  
 2 Government's Sentencing Memorandum,  
 3 PLTF\_2804\_000013676 - PLTF\_2804\_000013694  
 4 Prevoznik P53 Photo of monkeys, hear no 1008  
 5 evil, see no evil, speak no evil  
 6 Prevoznik P54 DEA Update Notes, Mark 1012  
 7 Caverly and James Crawford, MNK-T1\_0008504654 -  
 8 MNK-T1\_0008504657  
 9 Prevoznik P55 Executive Summary Regarding 1015 the  
 HDMA document,  
 10 MCKMDL00561303 - MCKMDL00561306  
 11 Prevoznik P56 DEA Enforcement Actions 1022  
 12 Against Distributors and Pharmacies timeline  
 13 Prevoznik P57 US DOJ January 30, 2018 1040  
 14 letter to Honorable Dan A. Polster  
 15 Prevoznik P58 Declaration of Michael L. 1049  
 16 Arpaio, DEA\_Rannazzisi-00006060 -  
 17 DEA\_Rannazzisi-00006061  
 18 Prevoznik P59 Statement of Demetra Ashley 1055 before  
 the Judiciary  
 19 Committee, United States Senate, December 12, 2017  
 20 Prevoznik P60 US DEA PowerPoint 1058  
 21 "Prescription Opioids to Heroin: A Natural  
 22 Progression," June 14, 2014, DEA\_Rannazzisi-00003482  
 23  
 24

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 799

1  
 2 CERTIFICATE.....1265  
 3 ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT..... 1267  
 4 ERRATA.....1268  
 5 LAWYER'S NOTES.....1269  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 801

1 EXAMINATION (continued)  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. Good morning.  
 4 A. Good morning.  
 5 Q. Welcome back to day three of  
 6 your deposition, Mr. Prevoznik.  
 7 I'll remind you or let me ask  
 8 you to recall that today you'll be testifying  
 9 on behalf of the United States Drug  
 10 Enforcement Administration, the DEA, on  
 11 subject matters that have been requested in  
 12 this litigation.  
 13 Continuing the line of  
 14 discussion, I'm going to -- I have marked,  
 15 premarked, and am showing you Plaintiff's  
 16 Exhibit 17, and the first thing I'd like to  
 17 do is I'd like to direct your attention to  
 18 the bottom right-hand corner.  
 19 And you see the numbers  
 20 US-DEA-00025656?  
 21 A. Yes, I do.  
 22 Q. I'll represent to you that's a  
 23 Bate stamp number provided by the Department  
 24 of Justice. And what I wanted to do was to  
 25 lay a little foundation on the documents that

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 800

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 802

1 VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on  
 2 the record. My name is Dan Lawlor.  
 3 I'm a videographer with Golkow  
 4 Litigation Services.  
 5 Today's date is May 17, 2019,  
 6 and the time is 8:10 a.m.  
 7 This video deposition is being  
 8 held in Washington, DC, in the matter  
 9 of National Prescription Opiate  
 10 Litigation, MDL Number 2804.  
 11 The deponent is Thomas  
 12 Prevoznik.  
 13 Counsel will be noted on the  
 14 stenographic record.  
 15 The court reporter is Carrie  
 16 Campbell and will now swear in the  
 17 witness.  
 18  
 19 THOMAS PREVOZNIK,  
 20 of lawful age, having been first duly sworn  
 21 to tell the truth, the whole truth and  
 22 nothing but the truth, deposes and says on  
 23 behalf of the Plaintiffs, as follows:  
 24 (Prevoznik Plaintiff Exhibit  
 25 P17 marked for identification.

1 bear such a Bate stamp.  
 2 The DEA has produced through  
 3 the United States Department of Justice more  
 4 than 6,000 documents in this litigation  
 5 spanning more than 26,000 pages.  
 6 Do you acknowledge as the  
 7 representative of the DEA that all such  
 8 documents bearing the US DEA Bates stamp are,  
 9 in fact, true and accurate photocopies of  
 10 documents in the possession, custody and  
 11 control of the DEA?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Sorry.  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Tom. Scope.  
 15 You can answer.  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 17 Foundation.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. And the DEA is, in fact, the  
 21 custodian of these documents?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 23 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 24 Foundation.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 803

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 2 Q. So as the DEA, you acknowledge  
 3 that the documents produced by the Department  
 4 of Justice bearing this Bates stamp number  
 5 are documents that come from the DEA which  
 6 are held in the usual course of the regularly  
 7 conducted activity of the DEA?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 10 Foundation.  
 11 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You can  
 13 answer.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 16 Q. All right. Moving to the first  
 17 document, P17.  
 18 Do you recognize this document?  
 19 And this isn't Jeopardy. This document  
 20 actually was included in your reliance  
 21 materials.  
 22 But could you tell the jury  
 23 what this document is?  
 24 A. This document is a report based  
 25 off of a meeting, a conference that was held

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 805

1 DEA back at this time. I don't know what his  
 2 specific title was back then.  
 3 Q. You'll see that in the  
 4 provision on the demonstrative that I've  
 5 highlighted, the last sentence of the first  
 6 paragraph, would you please read that into  
 7 the record?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Starting with  
 9 "another area" or somewhere else?  
 10 MR. FARRELL: No, right above  
 11 it. The last sentence of that first  
 12 paragraph.  
 13 THE WITNESS: The NWA?  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 15 Q. Yes, sir.  
 16 A. "The NWA system, for example,  
 17 provide an excellent look-back, or trend  
 18 system, but the ability to identify one-time  
 19 suspicious orders should not be overlooked as  
 20 an element of a program."  
 21 Q. Is that consistent with the  
 22 guidance the DEA has provided manufacturers  
 23 and distributors regarding their obligations  
 24 under the Controlled Substances Act and the  
 25 regulations promulgated by the DEA?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 804

1 for manufacturers and wholesalers that we  
 2 sponsor.  
 3 Q. And what is the date?  
 4 A. April 7th through the 9th,  
 5 1987.  
 6 Q. I'm going to have you flip to  
 7 the very back page of the four-page document  
 8 that was provided by the DEA, and you'll see  
 9 there that there is a provision that talks  
 10 about excessive order monitoring program.  
 11 Is this a document that was  
 12 prepared by the DEA?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 14 Foundation.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 17 Q. So when you're reading this on  
 18 behalf of the DEA, the very first sentence  
 19 referenced the fact that the program was  
 20 chaired by Ronald Buzzeo.  
 21 Does the DEA know Ronald  
 22 Buzzeo?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. Who is Ronald Buzzeo?  
 25 A. He was a senior manager within

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 806

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 5 Q. Okay. So when we're talking  
 6 about the NWDA system, we have previously put  
 7 into the record the NWDA, but recently we've  
 8 gotten another document, another version of  
 9 the document, and I'm going to have it marked  
 10 as P18.  
 11 (Prevoznik Plaintiff Exhibit  
 12 P18 marked for identification.)  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 14 Q. So this is identical to the  
 15 document that has been circulated in  
 16 litigation before, but as you recall from the  
 17 last time we met, there were two pages at the  
 18 back of this document that were missing.  
 19 So the first thing I want to do  
 20 is note that -- you see at the bottom  
 21 right-hand corner there is a US DEA Bates  
 22 stamp of 00026139?  
 23 A. Correct.  
 24 Q. And what I'd like to do is I'd  
 25 like to address your attention to what is

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 807

1 page 7 of this policy.  
 2 **And again, building on the**  
 3 **testimony from the previous two days without**  
 4 **repeating it, I'm going to show you the**  
 5 **bottom right-hand corner is US-DEA-00026146,**  
 6 **and I'd ask you to read Roman Numeral IX into**  
 7 **the record.**  
 8 **A. "Single suspicious orders.**  
 9 **Single orders of unusual size or deviation**  
 10 **must be reported immediately. The submission**  
 11 **of a monthly printout of after-the-fact sales**  
 12 **will not relieve a registrant from the**  
 13 **responsibility of reporting these single**  
 14 **excessive or suspicious orders. DEA has**  
 15 **interpreted 'orders' to mean prior to**  
 16 **shipment."**  
 17 **Q. So my question to you is, is**  
 18 **this consistent with the guidance provided by**  
 19 **the DEA to wholesalers and distributors?**  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 21 Foundation.  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 23 Foundation.  
 24 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 809

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 2 form.  
 3 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
 4 **QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:**  
 5 Q. Okay. As the DEA, can you tell  
 6 me on page 2 who the author of this document  
 7 is?  
 8 A. Thomas Gitchel.  
 9 Q. And who is Thomas Gitchel?  
 10 A. He was -- at this point he was  
 11 the acting chief of diversion operations.  
 12 Q. Of the DEA?  
 13 A. Of the DEA.  
 14 Q. Okay. And I've highlighted  
 15 down -- a particular provision for emphasis  
 16 to build on the previous two days' testimony.  
 17 Beginning with "As previously discussed,"  
 18 could you read that provision into the  
 19 record?  
 20 A. "An after-the-fact computer  
 21 printout of sales data does not relieve a  
 22 registrant of its responsibility to report  
 23 excessive or suspicious orders when  
 24 discovered."  
 25 Q. Is this consistent with the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 808

1 **QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:**  
 2 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 3 guidance provided by Ronald Buzzeo at the  
 4 San Antonio conference hosted by the DEA?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 6 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 8 You can answer, if you know.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Scope.  
 10 **THE WITNESS: Looking at the**  
 11 two, yes.  
 12 **QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:**  
 13 Q. Now, I'm going to have you turn  
 14 to the NWDA policy and the comments that come  
 15 from the DEA that were previously discussed,  
 16 but I'm going to reference the Bates stamp  
 17 numbers in the bottom right-hand corner,  
 18 including US-DEA-00026148. It's dated  
 19 April 24, 1984.  
 20 Have you found it?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Okay. And again, we've already  
 23 established the foundation for this, but  
 24 we'll do it again.  
 25 Do you recognize this document?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 810

1 guidance the DEA has provided to the  
 2 wholesalers and manufacturers of prescription  
 3 opioids?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 5 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
 6 **QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:**  
 7 Q. I'm going to show you -- which  
 8 is the last page of this document. And  
 9 you'll see in the bottom right-hand corner is  
 10 US-DEA-00026150. It has the stamp of May 16,  
 11 1984.  
 12 And I would ask do you  
 13 recognize this document?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. And what is it?  
 16 A. It's a letter from Mr. Gitchel,  
 17 again, from DEA to the National Wholesale  
 18 Druggists' Association.  
 19 Q. And again, I've highlighted for  
 20 your convenience the last sentence of the  
 21 first paragraph beginning with the word  
 22 "however," and I'd ask for you to read it  
 23 into the record.  
 24 A. "However, I want to make it  
 25 clear that the submission of a monthly

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 811

1 printout of after-the-fact sales will not  
 2 relieve a registrant from the responsibility  
 3 of reporting excessive or suspicious orders.  
 4 DEA has interpreted 'orders' to mean prior to  
 5 shipment."  
 6 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 7 guidance the DEA has provided to wholesalers  
 8 and manufacturers of prescription opioids?  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 10 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 (Prevoznik Plaintiff Exhibit  
 13 P19 marked for identification.)  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 15 Q. The next document I'm going to  
 16 have marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 19, it  
 17 bears Bates stamp US-DEA-00025683. I'll give  
 18 you a second to take a look at it, but I'm  
 19 assuming you're familiar with this document.  
 20 Do you see the bottom  
 21 right-hand corner, it bears the Bates stamp  
 22 US DEA?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. Do you recognize this document?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 813

1 distributors of prescription opioids to adopt  
 2 uniform reporting procedures?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 4 Foundation.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. All right. What I'm going to  
 8 emphasize is the very last two sentences that  
 9 begin with "the submission."  
 10 Do you see that provision?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. And I'd ask you to read that  
 13 into the record.  
 14 A. "The submission of a monthly  
 15 printout of after-the-fact sales does not  
 16 relieve the registrant of the responsibility  
 17 of reporting excessive or suspicious orders.  
 18 These regulations require that a registrant  
 19 maintain a system to detect excessive orders  
 20 rather than sales of controlled substances."  
 21 Q. Is this statement consistent  
 22 with the guidance provided by the DEA to  
 23 wholesale distributors and manufacturers of  
 24 prescription opioids?  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 812

1 Q. What is it?  
 2 A. It's a letter from Mr. Buzzeo,  
 3 who was at that point the deputy director of  
 4 diversion control, to Walgreens.  
 5 Q. And what's the date?  
 6 A. December 27, 1988.  
 7 Q. Okay. Would you read the first  
 8 sentence that's emphasized on your monitor?  
 9 A. "References made to our  
 10 November 4, 1988 meeting regarding a proposed  
 11 system of detecting and reporting excessive  
 12 orders."  
 13 Q. All right. If you look down at  
 14 the -- you can read the rest -- the first  
 15 paragraph, but I'm going to direct your  
 16 attention to the beginning of the second  
 17 paragraph where it states, "The Drug  
 18 Enforcement Administration supports the  
 19 effort by the Walgreen Company to provide a  
 20 uniform reporting procedure for its  
 21 warehouses."  
 22 Do you see that?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. In fact, is this consistent  
 25 that the DEA has encouraged wholesalers and

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 814

1 Foundation.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. Now, not only being consistent,  
 5 this, in fact, is the actual statement  
 6 provided by the DEA to Walgreens, agreed?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 8 Foundation.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. Would you agree with me that  
 12 since at least 1988, Walgreens has been on  
 13 notice from the DEA that if they rely upon  
 14 after-the-fact sales to comply with the  
 15 Controlled Substances Act and the regulations  
 16 promulgated by the DEA, that they may not be  
 17 in compliance with federal law?  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 19 Foundation.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 22 Q. If any of the wholesale  
 23 distributors or manufacturers of prescription  
 24 opioids rely upon after-the-fact reporting of  
 25 excessive orders to -- as the system they

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 815

1 designed under 1301.74(b), is that sufficient  
 2 to comply with federal law?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 4 Foundation.  
 5 MR. MAHADY: Objection. Vague.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 7 repeat it?  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 9 Q. If any distributor of  
 10 prescription opioids relies upon  
 11 after-the-fact sales reporting as the full  
 12 scope of its compliance with 1301.74(b), does  
 13 the DEA believe that it's sufficient to  
 14 satisfy the obligations under federal law?  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 17 Foundation. Vague.  
 18 THE WITNESS: No.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. If any expert witness in this  
 21 litigation argues that after-the-fact sales  
 22 are sufficient to comply with federal  
 23 regulations, is the expert witness right or  
 24 wrong?  
 25 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 817

1 Q. Okay. Was this record made at  
 2 or near the time of someone with knowledge  
 3 about the conversations therein?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 7 Scope. Form. Foundation.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 9 You can answer.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. It appears, to give you the  
 13 short form of it, that this is a discussion  
 14 between Mr. Haislip and a Mr. Jordan.  
 15 Who is Mr. Haislip?  
 16 A. He was the director of the  
 17 Office of Diversion Control for DEA.  
 18 Q. What does that mean?  
 19 A. He's in charge of the diversion  
 20 program within DEA.  
 21 Q. So in the ranking, in my mind,  
 22 where does that put him in the rank?  
 23 A. He's the top.  
 24 Q. And then Mr. Jordan. Who is  
 25 Mr. Jordan?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 816

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 818

1 form. Scope.  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 3 THE WITNESS: They would be  
 4 wrong.  
 5 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 6 P20 marked for identification.)  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 8 Q. The next document I'm going to  
 9 have marked is P20.  
 10 And I'll direct your attention  
 11 to the bottom right-hand corner with the  
 12 Bates stamp US-DEA-00026154. It has the  
 13 stamp of December 8, 1993, and I'm going to  
 14 ask you if you recognize this document.  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. What is this document?  
 17 A. This is an internal document  
 18 from Gene Haislip, our director of Office and  
 19 Diversion Control DEA, to the SAC, or special  
 20 agent in charge, of our Dallas field  
 21 division.  
 22 Q. Okay. Is this the type of  
 23 document that the DEA keeps in the course of  
 24 its regularly conducted activity?  
 25 A. Yes.

1 A. He's the special agent in  
 2 charge of our Dallas field division, so he's  
 3 the head of the entire DEA Dallas field  
 4 division.  
 5 Q. And how many different field  
 6 divisions are there?  
 7 A. At this time or now?  
 8 Q. At this time.  
 9 If the DEA remembers in its  
 10 official capacity.  
 11 A. Yeah, I don't -- I'd be  
 12 speculating. I think it was 20.  
 13 Q. 20?  
 14 A. We're now up to 23.  
 15 Q. And how many people were in the  
 16 cog between the field division boss and the  
 17 director?  
 18 Is there two levels, three  
 19 levels of reporting or direct?  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague as to  
 21 time.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 23 Q. In 1993.  
 24 A. I'm not sure I understand what  
 25 you're asking.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 819

1 Q. I'm just trying to figure out  
 2 this communication.  
 3 Is it normal for a field  
 4 division boss to be communicating directly  
 5 with the director?  
 6 A. Yeah. I mean, they're both  
 7 SESes, so they're both --  
 8 Q. Okay.  
 9 A. They're both the same level.  
 10 Q. They're the same rank?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. All right. So it appears that  
 13 this is a discussion on whether or not the  
 14 DEA is going to provide guidelines on  
 15 suspicious order reporting.  
 16 Do you see that?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. And I'd ask you to begin  
 19 reading, as you see in the second paragraph,  
 20 their discussion 1301.74(b).  
 21 Do you see that?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. Now, this is in 1993.  
 24 Is 1301.74(b) the same in 1993  
 25 as it is today?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 821

1 distributors and manufacturers of  
 2 prescription opioids?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 4 Foundation.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. Now, again, we're going to be  
 8 talking about the NWDA again.  
 9 Do you see the beginning of the  
 10 second paragraph?  
 11 And it references the fact that  
 12 the DEA was, in fact, aware that the -- some  
 13 of the distributors were adopting the NWDA  
 14 suspicious order monitoring system.  
 15 Beginning with where I've  
 16 highlighted, can you please read that into  
 17 the record?  
 18 A. Start with "can"?

19 Q. You can, like, ad lib to get to  
 20 can, but, yeah.  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 22 THE WITNESS: "The NWDA  
 23 suspicious order monitoring system,  
 24 SOM, which has been adopted by many  
 25 distributors throughout the United

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 820

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. And is it the same in all  
 3 meaningful ways to what it looked like when  
 4 it was enacted in 1971?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. So beginning with  
 7 "Section 1301.74(b)," could you read the next  
 8 sentence?  
 9 A. "1301.74(b) of Title 21 of the  
 10 Code of Federal Regulations clearly places  
 11 the responsibility for designing and  
 12 operating a system to identify suspicious  
 13 orders of controlled substances on the  
 14 registrant. Implicit in this regulation is  
 15 the idea that the registrant should not  
 16 merely be accumulating data on what appear to  
 17 be excessive purchases for eventual  
 18 submission to DEA but rather that the system  
 19 be monitored so that any such orders will be  
 20 apparent to the registrant so that they -- so  
 21 that they can be reported to DEA upon  
 22 discovery and, whenever possible, before the  
 23 order is shipped."  
 24 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 25 guidance provided by the DEA to wholesale

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 822

1 States, can be an effective monitoring  
 2 and reporting system provided that the  
 3 firm's using it to recognize their  
 4 responsibility to actively monitor  
 5 sales to detect suspicious orders."  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 7 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 8 guidance provided by the DEA to wholesale  
 9 distributors and manufacturers of  
 10 prescription opioids?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 12 Foundation.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 15 Q. Now, at the very bottom, there  
 16 is a discussion from the director beginning  
 17 with the last paragraph on the bottom of the  
 18 page beginning "what is -- what is of  
 19 particular concern."  
 20 Can you please read that into  
 21 the record?  
 22 A. "What is of particular concern  
 23 to me is the statement that appears on the  
 24 report submitted by the McKesson Corporation  
 25 in Fort Worth, Texas. For example, 'With the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 823

1 submission of this report, we are leaving to  
 2 the DEA the final determination of whether  
 3 they are suspicious or unusual.' This  
 4 position is unacceptable and clearly in  
 5 contravention to the requirements of 21 CFR  
 6 1301.74(b).  
 7 "A registrant whose own  
 8 personnel are in the best position to  
 9 determine what is excessive or unusual based  
 10 on knowledge of their customers and usual  
 11 purchasing practices may not abrogate its  
 12 responsibility to identify suspicious orders  
 13 and to determine whether to ship or refuse to  
 14 ship the controlled substance order.  
 15 "The registrant must also  
 16 report any suspicious orders as soon as  
 17 possible to the DEA. This has been conveyed  
 18 to the McKesson national management in San  
 19 Francisco, and they have agreed to remove the  
 20 statement from reports."  
 21 Q. So on behalf of the DEA, can  
 22 you validate that this is a true and accurate  
 23 summary of the conversation between the DEA  
 24 and McKesson?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 825

1 repeat that?  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. Is a registrant allowed to  
 4 delegate its obligations under 1301.74(b) to  
 5 another party to perform and escape liability  
 6 from the DEA for failure to comply?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 8 MR. MAHADY: Foundation.  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 10 THE WITNESS: No.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. So if a registrant that has an  
 13 obligation under the CSA delegates the  
 14 responsibilities to, say, UPS and/or Federal  
 15 Express and a violation occurs, is the  
 16 registrant ultimately still responsible for  
 17 those violations?  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 19 Calls for a legal conclusion. Scope.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 21 hypothetical.  
 22 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, can  
 23 you please repeat it?  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 25 Q. If Actavis delegates to UPS

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 824

1 MR. MAHADY: Object to form.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. Is this consistent with the  
 5 guidance that DEA provided not only to  
 6 McKesson but to every other wholesale  
 7 distributor and manufacturer of prescription  
 8 opioids?  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 10 Foundation.  
 11 MR. MAHADY: Objection.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 15 Q. Now, follow up real quick. You  
 16 see here where it says that "a registrant may  
 17 not abrogate its responsibility"? I have a  
 18 follow-up question to that.  
 19 Is a registrant permitted to  
 20 delegate this -- its obligations to design  
 21 and operate a system to maintain effective  
 22 control against diversion to a third party  
 23 and avoid being held responsible by the DEA?  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Could you please

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 826

1 their obligations to maintain effective  
 2 control, and the DEA determines in their best  
 3 judgment and upon investigation that a  
 4 violation has occurred, does the DEA take the  
 5 position that Actavis is still ultimately  
 6 responsible for the violation?  
 7 MS. MATIC: Objection to form.  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 9 Calls for a legal conclusion. Scope.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. Would the DEA in fact  
 13 investigate and, if they found probable  
 14 cause, prosecute both UPS and Actavis under  
 15 that hypothetical?  
 16 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 17 Scope. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 18 Hypothetical. Form.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let me  
 20 object. Scope.  
 21 THE WITNESS: I would agree we  
 22 would investigate. I don't -- I don't  
 23 know where the investigation would go,  
 24 but we would investigate it.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 827

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 2 Q. And if you found that UPS  
 3 violated the Controlled Substances Act, would  
 4 you prosecute both UPS and Actavis?  
 5 A. It, again, depends --  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Same objections.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Depends on what  
 9 the evidence shows, but we would  
 10 investigate it, both parties.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. That's fair. It's tough to  
 13 give a hypothetical with this scenario, so  
 14 let me see if I can be more direct.  
 15 If Cardinal Health delegates  
 16 its obligations under 1301.74(b) to CVS to  
 17 police themselves, is that -- does the DEA  
 18 consider that in compliance with federal law?  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 20 Scope. Incomplete hypothetical.  
 21 Foundation. Form.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Join as to  
 23 incomplete hypothetical.  
 24 THE WITNESS: No.  
 25 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 829

1 A. Is this a different...  
 2 Q. It should be the same one. If  
 3 you look at what I highlighted there, it's  
 4 only one page.  
 5 A. It's only one page?  
 6 Q. Yeah. You see where my finger  
 7 is right here?  
 8 A. That one. Sorry. Yeah.  
 9 Sorry, I'm good.  
 10 Q. All right. Now, if you look,  
 11 I'm going to -- I'm going to give you a  
 12 chance to take a read, but I'm going to  
 13 summarize it for you.  
 14 Is this the DEA's publication  
 15 and notice to the public that it was forming  
 16 a task force on suspicious orders pursuant to  
 17 the Comprehensive Methamphetamine Control Act  
 18 of 1996?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Take your  
 20 time to read it if you need to.  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. All right. Now, when you look  
 25 at the public notice, it states that "the DEA

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 828

1 P21 marked for identification.)  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. I'm going to mark next what's  
 4 going to be P21 and hand it to you. And I'll  
 5 have you look at the bottom right-hand  
 6 corner. You'll note that there's a Bates  
 7 stamp US-DEA-00025302.  
 8 Do you recognize this document?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. What is it?  
 11 A. It's a Federal Register  
 12 announcing that there's going to be a meeting  
 13 for the task force on suspicious orders  
 14 December 16th and 17th of 1997.  
 15 Q. Does the DEA publish in the  
 16 Federal Register notices for the entire world  
 17 that can read English to read?  
 18 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 21 Q. You'll note that this in  
 22 particular Federal Register action has been  
 23 labeled "Notice of Establishment of Task  
 24 Force on Suspicious Orders."  
 25 Do you see that?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 830

1 is establishing a task force on suspicious  
 2 orders for the purpose of developing  
 3 proposals to define suspicious orders of  
 4 listed chemicals."  
 5 Do you see that?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. As we discussed at length  
 8 before, prescription opioids are not  
 9 necessarily listed chemicals, are they?  
 10 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 11 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 14 Q. Well, let's be a little more  
 15 direct.  
 16 The DEA makes proposals and  
 17 provides input on what should be a listed  
 18 chemical and what should be a controlled  
 19 substance, agreed?  
 20 A. Agreed.  
 21 Q. And the listed chemicals that  
 22 they're referencing in this public notice for  
 23 this task force relate to the Methamphetamine  
 24 Act and ephedrine and pseudoephedrine used to  
 25 make methamphetamine --

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 831

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
2 form.  
3 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
4 Q. Agreed?  
5 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
7 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
8 Q. And as we discussed previously,  
9 suspicious orders of listed chemicals used to  
10 make methamphetamine are defined as orders  
11 that are extraordinary in size, agreed?  
12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection to  
13 form. Calls for speculation.  
14 THE WITNESS: Agreed.  
15 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
16 Q. And there's a different  
17 standard and a different regulation that  
18 govern controlled substances or suspicious  
19 orders of controlled substances, agreed?  
20 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
21 THE WITNESS: Agreed.  
22 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
23 Q. Now, when you look at this  
24 notice, it says, "The proposals establish  
25 guidelines that will adequately define

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 833

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
2 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
3 Foundation.  
4 MS. MAINIGI: Also scope.  
5 THE WITNESS: No.  
6 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
7 Q. Now, if you look at the bottom  
8 right-hand corner, you'll see who the DEA was  
9 tasked to add to this task force.  
10 Did the DEA, in fact, add to  
11 this task force a member from the National  
12 Association of Boards of Pharmacy?  
13 A. Yes.  
14 Q. And members from the Chemical  
15 Manufacturers Association?  
16 A. Yes.  
17 Q. And members from the National  
18 Association of Chemical Distributors?  
19 A. Yes.  
20 Q. And a member from the  
21 Nonprescription Drug Manufacturers  
22 Association?  
23 A. Yes.  
24 Q. And, in fact, four members from  
25 the wholesale and retail pharmaceutical

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 832

1 suspicious orders of listed chemicals."  
2 Do you see that?  
3 A. Yes.  
4 Q. Does the DEA believe this task  
5 force was assigned the project of defining  
6 suspicious orders of controlled substances  
7 that don't contain listed chemicals?  
8 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
9 Calls for speculation. Foundation.  
10 THE WITNESS: No.  
11 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
12 Q. So the DEA not only was on this  
13 task force, it was assigned the obligation by  
14 Congress to form this task force. So I'm not  
15 asking you to speculate. I'm asking the DEA  
16 itself.  
17 When you promulgated this  
18 report to the Attorney General, were you  
19 intending to provide any guidance to the  
20 wholesale distributors and manufacturers of  
21 prescription opioids that it should be using  
22 the standards therein to measure whether or  
23 not a suspicious order of controlled  
24 substances falls under the federal  
25 regulations?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 834

1 marketing associations?  
2 A. Yes.  
3 (Prevoznik Plaintiff Exhibits  
4 P22, P23, P24 and P25 marked for  
5 identification.)  
6 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
7 Q. All right. I've got three  
8 documents I'm going to show you now, and  
9 they're going to be marked separately P22,  
10 P23 and P24. Oops, and P25. There's four  
11 documents in total.  
12 And I'll give you a second to  
13 review it while we pass it around the table.  
14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I have three  
15 documents. Because mine are not  
16 marked, perhaps you can just tell me  
17 which is which in terms of exhibit  
18 number?  
19 MR. FARRELL: Yeah, the  
20 first -- they should be in  
21 chronological order. So it should go  
22 AmerisourceBergen first. The top  
23 right is August 16, 2005, Bates stamp  
24 US-DEA-00000147.  
25 The next one should be --

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 835

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You didn't  
 2 give me 147.  
 3 Okay. 147 is 22, correct?  
 4 MR. FARRELL: Yes.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 6 MR. FARRELL: The next one is  
 7 Cardinal Health, I believe, and it  
 8 bears Bates stamp US-DEA, a bunch of  
 9 zeros, and then 352.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 11 MR. FARRELL: Then the next  
 12 one, I believe, should be December 6,  
 13 2005, and in the bottom right-hand  
 14 corner is US-DEA-00000369.  
 15 And then the final one is dated  
 16 January 23, 2006, in the bottom  
 17 right-hand corner is US-DEA-00000371.  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 20 Q. Let me know when you're ready  
 21 to proceed.  
 22 Do you want to take a few  
 23 minutes to read these?  
 24 A. Yes, please.  
 25 Q. Do you want to take a quick

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 837

1 twice.  
 2 Q. Okay. So in general, are these  
 3 the documents the DEA created to internally  
 4 memorialize the initial meetings in and  
 5 around 2005 that the jury has heard about  
 6 related to what's called the distributor  
 7 initiative?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. Now, these documents weren't  
 10 provided to the registrants, were they?  
 11 A. These reports?  
 12 Q. Correct.  
 13 A. Correct.  
 14 Q. But these documents were  
 15 created -- let me back up.  
 16 Do you have knowledge of  
 17 whether these documents were made at or near  
 18 the time of the meetings?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 20 Foundation.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Well, from the  
 22 date stamp, it's around those dates.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. Is this reflective of the  
 25 practice of the DEA, with regard to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 836

1 break while we do so?  
 2 MS. SINGER: Let's keep going.  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Do we typically go  
 4 off the record to review documents?  
 5 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: No.  
 6 MR. FARRELL: I didn't say  
 7 that. I said -- I asked him if he  
 8 wanted to take a break, and he said  
 9 no.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. I don't know if this will save  
 12 you some time. I'm not intending on quizzing  
 13 you on the contents of these, other than  
 14 establishing what they are and the foundation  
 15 for what the DEA was doing.  
 16 A. Okay.  
 17 Q. I'm going to ask you first: Do  
 18 you recognize these documents?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. Okay. What are they  
 21 collectively?  
 22 A. Collectively they represent  
 23 what happened with meetings with the  
 24 respective registrants, AmerisourceBergen,  
 25 Cardinal, McKesson and -- I see McKesson

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 838

1 distributor initiative, to document what  
 2 happened during the meetings with  
 3 registrants?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Now, the DEA has conducted  
 6 hundreds of these meetings, correct?  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 10 Q. So rather than go through all  
 11 of them, if one of these memorandums contains  
 12 a Bates stamp of US DEA and is produced by  
 13 the Department of Justice in this litigation,  
 14 is it the DEA's position that the photocopy  
 15 being submitted is a true and accurate copy  
 16 of the original?  
 17 MR. MAHADY: Objection.  
 18 Foundation.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 21 Q. Does the DEA acknowledge that  
 22 all of those such documents bearing the  
 23 US DEA Bates stamp are, in fact, in the  
 24 possession, custody and control of the DEA  
 25 and document the discussions and contents of

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 839

1 each distributor initiative meeting?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. So in particular what I'd ask  
 4 you to do is to go to the very -- is to go to  
 5 the first one, which is AmerisourceBergen's,  
 6 and you'll see that this is the summary of  
 7 the meeting on August 10, 2005.  
 8 Do you see that?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. And it goes through and it  
 11 describes all of the things that were  
 12 discussed in the documents that were provided  
 13 during the meeting.  
 14 Do you see that?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Now, I'll represent to you that  
 17 I'm not going to produce all of the thousands  
 18 of pages as an exhibit, but I'll represent to  
 19 you that there are, in fact, exhibits that go  
 20 with this that the DEA produced in this  
 21 litigation.  
 22 Agreed?  
 23 MR. MAHADY: Objection. Form.  
 24 Objection to foundation.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 841

1 distributor of the responsibility to maintain  
 2 effective controls against diversion."  
 3 Did I read that accurately?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Okay. Why did the DEA put the  
 6 word "not" in all caps?  
 7 A. To emphasize that they had to  
 8 provide the suspicious order, not just -- not  
 9 just after-sales reports.  
 10 Q. The next slide, it says, "The  
 11 DEA cannot tell a distributor if an order is  
 12 legitimate or not" and that "the distributor  
 13 must determine which orders are suspicious  
 14 and make a sales decision."  
 15 Is this similar to all of the  
 16 other slide shows the DEA provided to the  
 17 distributors back in the 2000 -- 2005, 2006  
 18 time frame?  
 19 MR. MAHADY: Objection to form.  
 20 Objection to foundation.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 23 Q. In other words, this PowerPoint  
 24 presentation, was it a stock PowerPoint  
 25 presentation that was shown to Cardinal

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 840

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 842

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 2 Q. Now, one of the things I'd like  
 3 to direct your attention to is that many of  
 4 the distributors have made the statement that  
 5 this presentation was only related to  
 6 Internet pharmacies. And in fact, I believe  
 7 they asked you that question during the time  
 8 that they deposed you for the previous two  
 9 days.  
 10 What I'd ask you to do is I'd  
 11 ask you to turn to page 7 of the PowerPoint  
 12 presentation with AmerisourceBergen.  
 13 And you see where it says,  
 14 "Report suspicious orders to DEA when  
 15 discovered"?

16 Do you see that?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. So this is the PowerPoint slide  
 19 by the DEA with AmerisourceBergen as early as  
 20 2005.  
 21 Agreed?  
 22 A. Agreed.  
 23 Q. And if you look at the next  
 24 slide, it states, "Reporting a suspicious  
 25 order to the DEA does not relieve the

1 Health?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. Was it shown to McKesson?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Was it shown to CVS?  
 6 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.  
 7 Form. Lack of foundation.  
 8 MR. FARRELL: That actually  
 9 might be right.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. Was it -- to all of the  
 12 distributors that the DEA met with in 2005  
 13 and 2006, is this the stock PowerPoint  
 14 presentation that was used?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 18 Q. So I'm also going to have you  
 19 flip to page 12.  
 20 In the summary slides, the very  
 21 last bullet point, can you read what that  
 22 says?  
 23 A. "Not limited to Internet  
 24 pharmacies."  
 25 Q. What does that mean?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 843

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 2 Foundation.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 4 Q. Go ahead.  
 5 A. It's not just the -- what the  
 6 Internet pharmacies was, but it would be any  
 7 pharmacy, retail.  
 8 Q. The very next slide, it says,  
 9 "A pattern of drugs being distributed to  
 10 pharmacies who are diverting controlled  
 11 substances demonstrates the lack of effective  
 12 controls against diversion by the  
 13 distributor."  
 14 This PowerPoint presentation in  
 15 the distributor initiative meeting, it was  
 16 not just limited to rogue Internet  
 17 pharmacies, was it?  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 19 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 20 THE WITNESS: No. The emphasis  
 21 was regarding the Internet, but it was  
 22 for the totality of their  
 23 responsibilities as a registrant.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 25 Q. But as consistent with the very

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 845

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 2 Q. Now, the next one is McKesson,  
 3 and we're going to take a real quick stop to  
 4 take a look at this one.  
 5 This is dated -- the first one  
 6 is December 6, 2005, and it appears to be a  
 7 conference call with Mr. John Gilbert.  
 8 Do you see that?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. And Mr. Mapes and Kyle Wright  
 11 of the DEA.  
 12 Who are Mr. Mapes and  
 13 Mr. Wright of the DEA?  
 14 A. Mr. Mapes was the section chief  
 15 of our E-Commerce section, and Kyle Wright at  
 16 this time was a staff coordinator in  
 17 Mr. Mapes' section.  
 18 Q. So the next plaintiff's exhibit  
 19 has the Bates stamp at the bottom corner of  
 20 US-DEA-00000371, and you'll see that it's  
 21 dated January 23, 2006, but it's referencing  
 22 a January 3, 2006 meeting.  
 23 Do you see that?  
 24 A. Yes.  
 25 Q. And in it you can see where it

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 844

1 next sentence, did the DEA make it clear to  
 2 those distributors that it met with in 2005  
 3 and 2006 that if they didn't comply with  
 4 federal law regarding the detection, the  
 5 reporting and the halting of suspicious  
 6 orders, that the DEA may revoke their  
 7 registration?  
 8 MR. MAHADY: Objection to form.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 11 Q. Cardinal Health is the next  
 12 plaintiff's exhibit, Bates-stamped  
 13 US-DEA-352. And just to make sure that  
 14 there's no hanky-panky, you'll see that the  
 15 PowerPoint slide is attached to this document  
 16 as well and is consistent with all the other  
 17 PowerPoint slides provided to the -- or all  
 18 the other distributor initiative meetings.  
 19 Would you agree with that?  
 20 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.  
 21 Form.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 MS. FUMERTON: Lack of  
 24 foundation.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 846

1 looks like it contains -- this is the  
 2 memorandum of the meeting between McKesson  
 3 and the DEA as a result of the distributor  
 4 initiative. Agreed?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Object to form and  
 6 foundation.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 9 Q. Now, what I'm going to ask you  
 10 to do is I'm going to ask you to go to the  
 11 end of page 2. And at the bottom, starting  
 12 with the word "after," the very last  
 13 paragraph, I'd ask you to read that into the  
 14 record.  
 15 A. "After the conclusion of this  
 16 meeting, it was learned from Gary Hilliard of  
 17 McKesson Corp that one of the reasons they  
 18 were not able to realize the full volume of  
 19 hydrocodone product going out to the Florida  
 20 pharmacies was that their reports only  
 21 included the name brand hydrocodone products  
 22 distributed and was leaving out the generic  
 23 products."  
 24 Q. The next sentence.  
 25 A. "It was only after realizing

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 847

1 that the generic were not being reported was  
 2 McKesson Corp then able to see the large  
 3 quantities that DEA was bringing to  
 4 McKesson's attention."

5 Q. So I don't know how to say this  
 6 any other way, but in 2006 when the DEA met  
 7 with McKesson with its distributor initiative  
 8 program, was it discovered that McKesson was  
 9 only tracking the brand name prescription  
 10 opiates?

11 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.

12 Foundation. Calls for speculation.

13 Scope.

14 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 15 repeat it?

16 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

17 Q. This document, following the  
 18 distributor initiative meeting between the  
 19 DEA and McKesson, appears to present the fact  
 20 that the DEA discovered McKesson was only  
 21 tracking brand name prescription opiates.

22 A. Correct.

23 MR. EPPICH: Object to the

24 form. Foundation. Calls for  
 25 speculation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 849

1 You can answer in your personal  
 2 capacity, but not on behalf of the  
 3 DEA.

4 THE WITNESS: I have no idea.

5 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

6 Q. A lot?

7 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.

8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 9 objection.

10 THE WITNESS: Yes.

11 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

12 Q. All right. On a scale of 0 of

13 10 of screw-ups, how big of a screw-up is

14 this?

15 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.

16 Argumentative.

17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 18 objection.

19 You can answer in your personal  
 20 capacity, but not on behalf of the  
 21 DEA.

22 THE WITNESS: In my personal  
 23 capacity, a big one, a really big one.

24 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

25 Q. Epic?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 848

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 850

1 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. If, in fact, McKesson was only  
 4 tracking brand name prescription opiates and  
 5 leaving out the generic products, is that a  
 6 violation of federal law?

7 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 8 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 9 Calls for a legal conclusion.

10 THE WITNESS: Yes.

11 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 12 Q. Sitting here today as the  
 13 custodian of ARCos and the institutional  
 14 knowledge of the Drug Enforcement  
 15 Administration, if this is true, how many  
 16 generic prescription orders do you estimate  
 17 that McKesson missed prior to 2005?

18 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 19 form. Calls for speculation. Calls  
 20 for a legal conclusion, and I believe  
 21 it would be outside the Touhy  
 22 authorization.

23 MS. MAINIGI: Join.  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 25 for speculation.

1 A. Yes.

2 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.

3 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit

4 P26 marked for identification.)

5 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

6 Q. We're now going to jump ahead a  
 7 little bit. I'm going to show you what's  
 8 next marked as Plaintiff's 26.

9 This is a series of letters  
 10 that the DEA, institutionally and with  
 11 perfect recollection, will recall that --

12 between the lawyers for Cardinal Health and  
 13 the DEA, the first time they got in trouble  
 14 for breaking the law in 2008.

15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

16 Scope. Foundation. Form.

17 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

18 Q. Now, without having to go  
 19 through all of the nuances, what I'm going to  
 20 ask you to do is I'm going to make a  
 21 reference now. At the bottom right-hand  
 22 corner is Bates stamp CAH\_MDL2804\_01376799.  
 23 Do you see that? 799 are the  
 24 last three numbers.  
 25 A. Yes, I have it.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 851

1 Q. Now, in it, in this letter,  
 2 Larry -- to Larry Cote from Cardinal Health's  
 3 lawyers, it seems to indicate that controlled  
 4 substances that are sold by Cardinal Health  
 5 to CVS, Walgreens, Kroger, Kmart and Winn  
 6 Dixie, which are large, national or regional  
 7 chains, pose no threat of diversion due to  
 8 their sophisticated anti-diversion systems  
 9 and historical record of compliance.

10 Do you see that?

11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.

12 Scope. Foundation.

13 THE WITNESS: Yes.

14 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

15 Q. Did I read that accurately?

16 A. Yes.

17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

18 THE WITNESS: Yes.

19 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

20 Q. Aside from me reading that  
 21 accurately, is it true that large, national,  
 22 regional chains of pharmacies pose no threat  
 23 of diversion of prescription opioids?

24 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.

25 Scope. Foundation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 853

1 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 2 repeat it?

3 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

4 Q. Does the DEA consider -- if a  
 5 wholesale distributor came to the DEA and  
 6 said, "I've got a new customer and it's CVS,  
 7 which is a national chain store, and because  
 8 they have such swell security, I don't want  
 9 to monitor them for suspicious orders. Is  
 10 that okay?"

11 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 12 form.

13 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

14 Q. What would the DEA say?

15 MR. EPPICH: Object to form and  
 16 incomplete hypothetical. Calls for a  
 17 legal conclusion. Foundation.

18 MS. MAINIGI: Scope.

19 THE WITNESS: They can't do  
 20 that.

21 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

22 Q. And what if I said, "I'm going  
 23 to do it anyway"?

24 MR. EPPICH: Same objection.

25 MS. MAINIGI: Same objection.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 852

1 THE WITNESS: It's not true.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. In fact, the DEA has  
 4 investigated and prosecuted many of the large  
 5 national or regional chains, including CVS  
 6 and Walgreens?

7 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.

8 Scope. Foundation.

9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.

10 Do not testify based on current  
 11 or ongoing investigations. You can  
 12 answer based on historical  
 13 investigations or prosecutions.

14 THE WITNESS: Yes.

15 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

16 Q. If a wholesale distributor  
 17 decides not to monitor a chain store  
 18 pharmacy, is that a per se violation of  
 19 federal law?

20 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.

21 Calls for a legal conclusion.

22 MS. MAINIGI: Scope.

23 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

24 Q. According to the DEA.

25 MR. EPPICH: Same objection.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 854

1 THE WITNESS: It's a decision  
 2 that they're making, and we're going  
 3 to investigate it and we're going to  
 4 do what we -- what we need to do to  
 5 protect the public.

6 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

7 Q. And what would you need to do  
 8 to protect the public?

9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Hang on.

10 Incomplete hypothetical.

11 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.

12 THE WITNESS: We would  
 13 investigate to see where the orders  
 14 went and how much went and who was --  
 15 what they were filling and who had  
 16 knowledge of what. What we normally  
 17 do with our investigations.

18 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:

19 Q. All right. Would the DEA  
 20 provide guidance to such a wholesale  
 21 distributor, that regardless of whether its  
 22 customer is a national chain pharmacy, the  
 23 distributor still must comply with  
 24 1301.74(b)?

25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 855

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 3 Q. What if I said to you, "Well,  
 4 how about this: How about if I only start  
 5 monitoring them after they reach a cap of  
 6 20,000 pills in a month?" Would you deem  
 7 that to be compliant with federal law?  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 9 form. Incomplete hypothetical. Calls  
 10 for a legal conclusion.  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 12 hypothetical.  
 13 THE WITNESS: No.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 15 Q. Now, in these correspondence  
 16 Cardinal Health's lawyers represent that  
 17 they're going to retain -- let me see if I  
 18 can find the right word and avoid an  
 19 objection.  
 20 You'll see here a consulting  
 21 firm named Cegedim Dendrite and that they're  
 22 going to provide the reports on controlled  
 23 substance orders to the DEA.  
 24 Do you see that?  
 25 A. What page are we on?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 857

1 document that bears the Bates stamp in the  
 2 bottom right-hand corner  
 3 CAH\_MDL2804\_03309960.  
 4 Have you -- has the DEA, in its  
 5 vast institutional knowledge, ever seen this  
 6 document before?  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 8 Scope. Objection. Form.  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: Mr. Finkelstein,  
 11 I'm assuming when you make a scope  
 12 objection that means you're  
 13 instructing him to answer in his  
 14 individual capacity?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: When I make a  
 16 scope objection and when I have made  
 17 such objections in the past, it should  
 18 be understood that you can answer  
 19 based on your personal knowledge in  
 20 your individual capacity, but your  
 21 answers do not bind the DEA.  
 22 Do you understand that?  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 MR. FARRELL: So we're going  
 25 to -- David, we're going to need you.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 856

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 858

1 Well, I would prefer to know  
 2 what page we're on.  
 3 Q. Okay. This is the -- the last  
 4 three digits are 803. And it's the first  
 5 full paragraph.  
 6 A. Okay.  
 7 Q. There's another reference in  
 8 here to Cegedim Dendrite, and I'll represent  
 9 to you that the correspondence indicates that  
 10 Cardinal Health was telling the DEA, "Please  
 11 don't revoke our license or suspend our  
 12 license or fine us. We're going to hire this  
 13 outside consultant, and we're going to share  
 14 the report with you." I'm going to make that  
 15 representation.  
 16 Has the DEA, in fact, ever seen  
 17 that report?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 19 THE WITNESS: I don't know. I  
 20 don't know.  
 21 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 22 P27 marked for identification.)  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MR. FARRELL:  
 24 Q. I'm going to have marked as  
 25 Plaintiff's Exhibit 27 and circulate a

1 I did not understand that when  
 2 you made an objection for scope that  
 3 we needed to preserve the right to be  
 4 able to -- that I was waiving my right  
 5 to have that objection ruled or  
 6 overruled.  
 7 So I disagree that every time  
 8 the Department of Justice makes an  
 9 objection on scope that transforms the  
 10 witness from a Rule 30(b)(6) designee  
 11 into a witness testifying in his own  
 12 capacity, because we did not notice  
 13 the deposition of Mr. Prevoznik in his  
 14 individual capacity. We noticed  
 15 him -- we noticed the DEA put a  
 16 witness up in its capacity.  
 17 That being said, perfectly  
 18 willing to allow the record to be  
 19 preserved with appropriate objections  
 20 to be addressed with Judge Polster,  
 21 but I believe Judge Polster has the  
 22 ultimate say in whether or not our  
 23 questions are admissible and whether  
 24 or not they fall inside or outside of  
 25 the scope of the 30(b)(6) notice.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 859

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: So my  
 2 response would be if Judge Polster  
 3 disagrees with my objections, then  
 4 Judge Polster will make appropriate  
 5 rulings.  
 6 If you disagree with my  
 7 objections, my proposal would be to  
 8 review the objections I've made at a  
 9 break, and we can take them up with  
 10 the Special Master as necessary.  
 11 MR. FARRELL: All right. We've  
 12 been going for an hour, so maybe this  
 13 is the right time to take a quick  
 14 break.  
 15 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off  
 16 the record. The time is 9:12.  
 17 (Off the record at 9:12 a.m.)  
 18 VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on  
 19 record. Beginning of Media File 2.  
 20 The time is 9:27.  
 21 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: So with  
 22 regard to the issue that came up just  
 23 before we went off the record, I think  
 24 to make the record clear as we go  
 25 forward, it would help if, rather than

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 861

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 2 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN:  
 3 Everybody understand that? Any  
 4 questions?  
 5 MS. SINGER: Nope.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm happy to  
 7 expand on my objections, and I'm happy  
 8 to explain them as necessary.  
 9 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: No, we  
 10 can do it in shorthand. I just want  
 11 to make sure we understand things,  
 12 that we're all on the same page going  
 13 forward.  
 14 Okay?  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: There will be no  
 16 ruling on those objections?  
 17 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: Correct.  
 18 EXAMINATION  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. All right. Good morning,  
 21 Mr. Prevoznik. Mr. Farrell was nice enough  
 22 to cover some of the things I was planning  
 23 to, so we're going to shorthand our way  
 24 through some of the opening topics.  
 25 Now, remind the jury, how long

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 860

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 862

1 merely saying "scope," when the DEA  
 2 has an objection that the answer is  
 3 outside the scope of Touhy authority,  
 4 that you just say that, "outside the  
 5 scope of Touhy authority."  
 6 With regard to the question of  
 7 whether it is outside the scope of  
 8 Touhy authority, I think the Court  
 9 does retain jurisdiction to make that  
 10 determination in the final event, as  
 11 with any objection.  
 12 And I will add that my own  
 13 understanding is that it's unclear  
 14 exactly whether a witness is allowed  
 15 to answer questions even though he  
 16 doesn't have authority under Touhy. I  
 17 think that's actually an open question  
 18 legally. But in any event, we don't  
 19 have to address that question now.  
 20 So when you are directed,  
 21 Mr. Prevoznik, to answer only within  
 22 the scope of your personal knowledge  
 23 and not as a -- with DEA authority,  
 24 that's what we'll assume you're doing.  
 25 Okay?

1 have you been with the DEA?  
 2 A. Over 28 years.  
 3 Q. Okay. And during the course of  
 4 your 20 years with the DEA, I imagine that  
 5 the drugs being diverted may have changed; is  
 6 that correct?  
 7 A. Yeah, that's trend shifts.  
 8 Q. And the means of diverting  
 9 those drugs may have changed over time as  
 10 well?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. And the focus of DEA's  
 13 enforcement activities may have changed also  
 14 during that time; is that correct?  
 15 A. Correct.  
 16 Q. But the DEA's rules and  
 17 expectations with respect to the Controlled  
 18 Substances Act and CFR 1301.74, those have  
 19 remained the same, have they not?  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 23 P29 marked for identification.)  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. All right. So we're going to

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 863

1 go quickly through the guidelines you talked  
 2 about. We're going to start with a  
 3 shorthand. And the first refers to what we  
 4 marked as Exhibit 18, is the backup for that.  
 5 So here you'll see the NWDA  
 6 suspicious order monitoring system, which we  
 7 were shown as Exhibit 18.  
 8 Is that familiar to you?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Okay. So in 1984 --  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm sorry,  
 12 Counsel, is this 18 or 29?  
 13 MS. SINGER: I think it's 18.  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: It's marked  
 15 as 29.  
 16 MS. SINGER: I'm sorry. Oh,  
 17 I'm sorry, the new exhibit is 29. The  
 18 backup of the whole policy is  
 19 Exhibit 18.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. Okay. And just directing your  
 23 attention very quickly to 2, sub 2, on your  
 24 monitor -- I'm sorry, 9 on your monitor,  
 25 single suspicious orders, is it correct that

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 865

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. And do ILRs relieve a  
 3 registrant -- does submitting ILRs relieve a  
 4 registrant of the obligation to report  
 5 suspicious orders?  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 7 THE WITNESS: No.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. All right. The next marker,  
 10 1987, is that seminar report which was  
 11 Prevoznik 17, and that established any system  
 12 must be capable of both detecting individual  
 13 orders or -- which are suspicious orders,  
 14 which become suspicious over time due to  
 15 frequency, quantity or pattern.  
 16 Is that consistent with the  
 17 DEA's policy?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. And the DEA pointed out that  
 20 the company is still responsible under their  
 21 registrations for acting in the public  
 22 interest, reporting the order does not in any  
 23 way relieve the firm from the responsibility  
 24 for the shipment.  
 25 Does that also reflect the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 864

1 this suspicious order monitoring system  
 2 publication from 1984 established that  
 3 "single orders of unusual size or deviation  
 4 must be reported immediately, the submission  
 5 of monthly printout of after-the-fact sales  
 6 will not relieve a registrant from the  
 7 responsibility of reporting these single  
 8 excessive or suspicious orders. DEA has  
 9 interpreted orders to mean prior to  
 10 shipment"?

11 Does that accurately reflect  
 12 the policy of the DEA?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. And that's as of 1984, correct?  
 15 A. Correct.  
 16 Q. All right. Turning next to  
 17 1987 is our next marker in the timeline.  
 18 And I'm sorry, just to be  
 19 perfectly clear, from 1971 to the present,  
 20 when the Controlled Substances Act was first  
 21 enacted in '71, has it been the DEA's  
 22 position that ILRs are not suspicious order  
 23 reports?  
 24 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 866

1 DEA's policy consistently over time?  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 3 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 5 (Prevoznik Plaintiff Exhibit  
 6 P33 marked for identification.)  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. Okay. I want to turn next to a  
 9 new document, and that's the DEA's Diversion  
 10 Investigators Manual.  
 11 Can we mark this as -- what are  
 12 we up to?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: 30.  
 14 MS. SINGER: Thank you.  
 15 (Prevoznik Exhibit 33 marked  
 16 for identification.)  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Is there no  
 18 28? Have we skipped 28? I don't  
 19 mind. I just want to make sure I have  
 20 everything.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, showing you  
 23 Exhibit 33. Do you recognize this document?  
 24 A. Yes.  
 25 Q. And what do you recognize that

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 867

1 document to be?  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Excuse me,  
 3 Counsel. May I have a copy?  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. What do you recognize that  
 6 document to be?  
 7 A. DEA's Diversion Investigators  
 8 Manual.  
 9 Q. And what is that -- what is the  
 10 Diversion Investigators Manual used for?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 12 THE WITNESS: It's used to  
 13 guide us, diversion investigators, on  
 14 how to do our jobs.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. Okay. And so that is internal  
 17 guidance provided by the DEA to its diversion  
 18 investigators, correct?  
 19 A. Correct.  
 20 Q. Okay. And do you know the year  
 21 of that version of the manual?  
 22 And again, it's not a quiz.  
 23 Does it seem like 1990, which was the  
 24 information provided to us, is accurate?  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Calls

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 869

1 A. Yep.  
 2 Q. All right. Can you read the  
 3 third paragraph beginning "registrants"?  
 4 A. "Registrants who routinely  
 5 report suspicious orders, yet fill these  
 6 orders with reason to believe they are  
 7 destined for the illicit market, are  
 8 expressing an attitude of irresponsibility  
 9 that is a detriment to the public health and  
 10 safety as set forth in 21 USC 823 and 824."  
 11 Q. And 21 USC 823 and 824 the  
 12 Controlled Substances Act?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. And does that statement  
 15 that you just read accurately reflect the  
 16 policy of the DEA in 1990?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. And has that remained true  
 19 since then?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. Okay. And then read from there  
 22 "suspicious orders"?

23 A. "Suspicious orders include  
 24 those which are in excess of legitimate  
 25 medical use or exhibit characteristics

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 868

1 for speculation.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. Okay. And is the Diversion  
 5 Investigators Manual updated periodically by  
 6 the DEA?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. And do you know whether at  
 9 least parts of the Diversion Investigators  
 10 Manual have been provided to distributors  
 11 through public record requests?  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 13 Scope. Or outside Touhy  
 14 authorization.  
 15 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. Okay. All right. I'd like to  
 18 turn your attention to Section 5126, which is  
 19 Bates number ending 301.  
 20 And I'm sorry, the Bates number  
 21 for this document is CAH\_MDL\_PRIOR  
 22 PRODUCTION\_DEA07\_01176247.  
 23 All right. So turning to 301,  
 24 which I think has been tabbed in your copy,  
 25 Mr. Prevoznik.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 870

1 leading to possible diversion, such as orders  
 2 of unusual size, unusual frequency, or those  
 3 deviating substantially from the -- from a  
 4 normal pattern."  
 5 Q. And keep going.  
 6 A. "The supplier can determine  
 7 whether the order is excessive by checking  
 8 their own sales and establishing the average  
 9 amount of controlled substances shipped to  
 10 registrants of the same apparent size in a  
 11 particular geographic area. If the customer  
 12 exceeds this threshold, the request should be  
 13 viewed as suspicious."  
 14 Q. One more sentence.  
 15 A. "This activity over extended  
 16 periods of time would lead a reasonable  
 17 person to believe that controlled substances  
 18 possibly are being diverted."  
 19 Q. And does the passage you just  
 20 read again reflect the DEA's policy?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Form.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 24 Q. And has that policy remained  
 25 the same since 1990 when this manual was

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 871

1 issued?  
 2 MS. FUMERTON: Object to form.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 4 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 5 P34 marked for identification.)  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. Okay. Now, moving to the next  
 8 version of the -- of the Diversion  
 9 Investigators Manual, we're going to mark  
 10 that Exhibit 34.  
 11 And, Mr. Prevoznik, we only  
 12 have a piece of that manual.  
 13 Do you recognize the document  
 14 that I've just shown you as Exhibit 34?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. And what do you recognize that  
 17 document to be?  
 18 A. As being a section from our --  
 19 the Diversion Investigators Manual.  
 20 Q. Okay.  
 21 A. DEA.  
 22 Q. And with respect to its  
 23 provisions on suspicious orders, which are  
 24 the first paragraph of Section 5126, is that  
 25 the same as what you just read previously?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 873

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, just to clarify  
 3 for Cardinal's counsel's benefit, do you  
 4 recognize this from the materials you  
 5 reviewed in preparation for your deposition?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Okay. And do you know if this  
 8 was part of the binder that was provided to  
 9 counsel in advance of your deposition?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. Okay. So can you read aloud  
 12 that first paragraph?  
 13 A. "Registrants are required to  
 14 inform DEA of suspicious orders in accordance  
 15 with 21 CFR 1301.74(b). DEA field offices  
 16 are not to approve or disapprove supplier  
 17 shipments of controlled substances. The  
 18 responsibility for making the decision to  
 19 ship rests with the supplier. An exception  
 20 to this occurs when a supplier" --  
 21 Q. You can stop there.  
 22 A. Okay.  
 23 Q. All right. And the section you  
 24 just read, does that reflect DEA's policy?  
 25 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 872

1 A. I'm sorry, which paragraph?  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 3 THE WITNESS: "Registrants"?:  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. I'm sorry. I don't have it up  
 6 on my monitor, so...  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: Counsel, may I  
 8 ask why this document is not  
 9 Bates-stamped?  
 10 MS. SINGER: Excuse me?  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Why is this  
 12 document not Bates-stamped?  
 13 MS. SINGER: I don't know.  
 14 Because it came from the DEA. I think  
 15 the reliance materials for  
 16 Mr. Prevoznik.  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Is that in fact a  
 18 representation you're making?  
 19 MS. SINGER: Excuse me?  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Is that in fact a  
 21 representation that you know for  
 22 certain, or are you guessing?  
 23 MS. SINGER: So you can ask  
 24 your questions in your time.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 874

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. And do you know, by the way,  
 4 the date of this version of the Diversion  
 5 Investigators Manual?  
 6 A. I can tell from the -- there  
 7 was an update on 4/16 of 1996.  
 8 Q. Okay. And then if you go down  
 9 to the third paragraph, "Registrants who  
 10 routinely report suspicious orders," is that  
 11 the same language that you read previously?  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 15 P35 marked for identification.)  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. Okay. All right. Let's turn  
 18 now to Exhibit 35.  
 19 All right. And this is --  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: While this is  
 21 being handed out, since we talked  
 22 about the reliance materials, I note  
 23 that the witness doesn't have a copy  
 24 of his reliance materials in front of  
 25 him and that I ask that he be provided

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 875

1 with that at some point.  
 2 We left it with the court  
 3 reporter. That was his reliance  
 4 binder.  
 5 MS. SINGER: So because we have  
 6 a different court reporter, I don't  
 7 think we have it. If -- we can try to  
 8 muster an additional copy, but any  
 9 document I show him, we will have  
 10 today.  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. All right. So Exhibit 35 is  
 14 the NWDA Controlled Substances Manual, Bates  
 15 number HDA\_MDL\_000219360.  
 16 Mr. Prevoznik, have you seen  
 17 that document before?  
 18 A. It looks familiar.  
 19 Q. Okay. Now, I want to show you  
 20 also -- we're going to mark this Exhibit 36.  
 21 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 22 P36 marked for identification.)  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 24 Q. Exhibit 36 is from a website.  
 25 It's titled "NWDA Develops DEA Compliance

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 877

1 this doc -- when this press release was  
 2 issued?  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to the  
 4 use of this document. Objection.  
 5 Foundation. Scope.  
 6 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what  
 7 you mean by the term "aggressively."  
 8 We were doing our job, so that  
 9 wouldn't...  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. All right. And then going down  
 12 to the third paragraph -- or fourth  
 13 paragraph -- you know what? We're going to  
 14 leave that one there. Let's move on. Let's  
 15 go back to the manual itself, Exhibit 34.  
 16 So I want to turn first to --  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: 34 or 35?  
 18 THE WITNESS: 35?  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. 35, thank you.  
 21 -- to Bates number 435, which  
 22 is tabbed in your copy. It's titled  
 23 "Suspicious Orders - Controlled Substances."  
 24 Let me know when you've found  
 25 it.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 876

1 Institute to Reduce Industry Exposure to  
 2 Fines."  
 3 All right. Giving you a second  
 4 to look at the document, I just want to read  
 5 aloud the first paragraph.  
 6 "In response to increasingly  
 7 complex regulations, aggressive enforcement  
 8 and the potential for fines, the National  
 9 Wholesale Druggists' Association, NWDA, has  
 10 developed an industry institute on DEA  
 11 compliance," continued.  
 12 Would you agree that the DEA  
 13 had been aggressively enforcing --  
 14 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to the  
 15 use of this document.  
 16 MS. SINGER: I haven't even  
 17 finished --  
 18 MS. MAINIGI: I'm sorry. Go  
 19 ahead.  
 20 MS. SINGER: -- a question.  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Sorry.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. Would you agree that the DEA  
 24 was aggressively or actively enforcing the  
 25 Controlled Substances Act in 1997 when

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 878

1 A. Yep, I'm good.  
 2 Q. Okay.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: I'm sorry,  
 4 Counsel, what's the page number?  
 5 MS. SINGER: 435.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. It says there, "Distributors  
 8 are responsible for designing and operating a  
 9 system that will disclose to the distributor  
 10 suspicious orders."  
 11 Do you agree that that is the  
 12 distributor's responsibility?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. And then the note, "Many  
 15 distributors have been cited for failing to  
 16 establish and maintain such a system."  
 17 Is that also accurate?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Form.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. Move to the next paragraph.  
 23 "Distributor establishing suspicious order  
 24 criteria. Distributors should establish  
 25 written criteria of what constitutes a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 879

1 suspicious order. DEA leaves it to the  
 2 distributor to make this determination. The  
 3 key for the distributor is to establish  
 4 reasonable criteria based upon customer  
 5 purchasing patterns and then to adhere to  
 6 them in monitoring orders."  
 7 Does that several-step passage  
 8 that I just read accurately reflect a  
 9 distributor's duties under the CSA?  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 11 Foundation. Scope. Form.  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. And do you see in this  
 16 description of suspicious order criteria any  
 17 expression of confusion or lack of clarity  
 18 about what a suspicious order is?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 21 Foundation.  
 22 THE WITNESS: No.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 24 Q. And then moving to the next  
 25 page, Bates number 436, you see the bullet

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 881

1 Q. Is it DEA's position that a  
 2 fixed multiplier of order levels is  
 3 sufficient as a system to identify suspicious  
 4 orders?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 6 THE WITNESS: It could be one  
 7 criteria, but it can't be the only  
 8 one.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. Okay. And it says here, if you  
 11 keep reading on, "After the monitoring  
 12 program has been tested with live data and  
 13 the results analyzed, it may be necessary to  
 14 revise the factors."  
 15 Is it DEA's position that  
 16 distributors have an obligation to make sure  
 17 that any trigger or threshold they use  
 18 actually identifies suspicious orders?  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to  
 21 form.  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Form. Scope.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. Okay. Moving next to Bates

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 880

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 882

1 that begins, "Establish trigger levels"?  
 2 About middle of the page.  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. Okay. So it says here,  
 5 "Establish trigger levels, close quote, that  
 6 only kick out purchasers buying substantially  
 7 above the average for an item. The trigger  
 8 level is established by multiplying the  
 9 calculated average by an arbitrary factor.  
 10 It is recommended that at the outset three  
 11 times the average be used for ARCOS items and  
 12 four times the average for non-ARCOS items."  
 13 Do you see where I've just  
 14 read?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Okay. Is it DEA's position  
 17 that a fixed multiplier is a sufficient  
 18 system to identify suspicious orders?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Foundation.  
 21 Scope.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 23 repeat it?  
 24 MS. SINGER: Yes.  
 25 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

1 number 437. Do you see the note is -- why  
 2 don't you go ahead and read that note.  
 3 "It is DEA's position."  
 4 A. "It is DEA's position that  
 5 after-the-fact monitoring program as  
 6 previously described, whether computer or  
 7 manual, does not relieve the distributor of  
 8 responsibility for policing individual orders  
 9 that appear excessive."  
 10 Q. Keep going.  
 11 A. "In these situations, DEA  
 12 should be notified before the order is  
 13 shipped, and a copy of all such orders should  
 14 be maintained in the distributor's suspicious  
 15 orders file, with a notation reflecting the  
 16 date and person contacted at DEA as well as  
 17 any guidance received."  
 18 Q. Go ahead and finish the  
 19 paragraph, please.  
 20 A. "The file also should indicate  
 21 whether the order was shipped. DEA usually  
 22 leaves the responsibility for determining  
 23 whether to ship to the distributor."  
 24 Q. And does this statement that  
 25 you just read from the NWDA manual of 1997

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 883

1 accurately describe the DEA's position on  
 2 what distributors should be -- or what  
 3 registrants should be doing?  
 4 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 5 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. All right. And then I want you  
 8 to turn to the chemical control program at  
 9 Appendix L. So that, I think, should be  
 10 marked by the last tab. Nope. Nope.  
 11 There's one more, I'm sorry. So L6, yes,  
 12 which is Bates number 571.  
 13 Do you see the heading there  
 14 "Suspicious Orders"?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: 571. 69, 71.  
 16 **THE WITNESS: Okay.**  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. All right. So the heading  
 19 there says, "Suspicious Orders," but it's  
 20 under 21 CFR 1310.05, correct?  
 21 A. Correct.  
 22 Q. And that's the provision that  
 23 relates to suspicious orders of List I  
 24 chemicals; is that correct?  
 25 A. Correct.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 885

1 frequency."  
 2 Q. Okay. Keep going all the way  
 3 to the end of that paragraph.  
 4 A. 21 CFR 1301.74(b).  
 5 "Registrants should set thresholds as a first  
 6 step in identifying potential suspicious  
 7 orders. However, registrants should refrain  
 8 from reporting all orders above the threshold  
 9 without a further review of the order or  
 10 customer. DEA expects that registrants will  
 11 only report orders that the registrant has  
 12 determined to be truly suspicious."  
 13 Q. And does the section you just  
 14 read reflect the policy of the DEA that  
 15 registrants should be reporting orders that  
 16 it deems suspicious?  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 18 **THE WITNESS: Yes.**  
 19 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 20 P37 marked for identification.)  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. All right. Let's move next to  
 23 Exhibit 37. We have a lot of paper today.  
 24 Exhibit 37 is Bates number  
 25 CAH\_MDL\_PRIOR PRODUCTION\_DEA07\_01178834, and

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 884

1 Q. Okay. And there it -- the  
 2 first sentence reads, "DEA has not provided a  
 3 clear definition of what constitutes a  
 4 **suspicious order.**"  
 5 **Now that relates to a**  
 6 **suspicious order of List I chemicals,**  
 7 **correct?**  
 8 A. Correct.  
 9 Q. Okay. And there NWDA is saying  
 10 we don't have a clear definition, correct?  
 11 A. Correct.  
 12 Q. And we didn't see that earlier  
 13 in the manual, correct?  
 14 A. Correct.  
 15 Q. All right. Then let's move to  
 16 **Appendix M, which is one more page. Bates**  
 17 number 574, number 7: "What does DEA  
 18 consider to be a suspicious order?"  
 19 And if you can read that first  
 20 sentence?  
 21 A. "A registrant must report a  
 22 suspicious order for controlled substances,  
 23 which DEA defines as an order of unusual  
 24 size, orders deviating substantially from a  
 25 normal pattern and orders of unusual

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 886

1 it's titled "DEA Compliance Manual, Cardinal  
 2 Health."  
 3 Mr. Prevoznik, have you seen  
 4 this document before?  
 5 A. No.  
 6 Q. Okay. I just want to point you  
 7 to a few pages. Let's turn first to  
 8 Bates number 880, which is also tabbed in  
 9 your copy.  
 10 Tell me when you're there.  
 11 A. I'm there.  
 12 Q. Okay. So it says, "Complying  
 13 with 21 CFR 1301.74(b) is a two-step process.  
 14 First, each Cardinal division submits to DEA  
 15 on a monthly basis an ingredient limit  
 16 report."  
 17 Have I read that correctly?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. Okay. And then it goes down to  
 20 the next paragraph. "Second, on a daily  
 21 basis, cage and vault personnel" --  
 22 Do you know what that means?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. What is that?  
 25 A. It's the person -- the people

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 887

1 that were -- that are authorized to work in  
 2 the cage or the vault, which are the secure  
 3 areas that contain the controlled substances.  
 4 Q. Okay.

5 -- "should be policing and  
 6 identifying individual orders that appear  
 7 excessive in relation to what other customers  
 8 are buying and/or the customer's purchase  
 9 history. In most situations, DEA should be  
 10 notified, if possible, before the order is  
 11 shipped, and a copy of all such orders should  
 12 be maintained in the division's suspicious  
 13 order file, along with a regulatory agency  
 14 contact form, Form 1, noting any specific  
 15 instructions from DEA."

16 Have I read that correctly?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. And does this Cardinal  
 19 compliance manual accurately reflect a  
 20 registrant's obligation to notify DEA before  
 21 a suspicious order is shipped?

22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

23 Outside the scope of the Touhy  
 24 authorization. Form. Foundation.

25 THE WITNESS: Well, the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 889

1 with Mr. Farrell was skipped over this time,  
 2 the DEA Diversion Investigators Manual, the  
 3 NWDA Controlled Substances Manual in 1997 and  
 4 Cardinal's compliance manual.  
 5 In each of those manuals, just  
 6 to be clear, was it true that DEA and the  
 7 industry recognized that suspicious orders  
 8 must be reported immediately when they are  
 9 discovered, not after they are shipped?

10 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

11 Outside the scope of the Touhy  
 12 authorization. Foundation. Form.

13 THE WITNESS: Yes.

14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

15 Q. And that suspicious -- that  
 16 orders that a registrant identifies as  
 17 suspicious cannot be shipped; is that  
 18 correct?

19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.  
 20 Foundation.

21 THE WITNESS: Correct.

22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

23 Q. All right. Now, we think about  
 24 suspicious orders under CFR 1301.74, but the  
 25 registrant that ships suspicious orders also

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 888

1 regulations require immediately upon  
 2 discovery, so it's not...  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. Okay. If that was added, that  
 5 they should be notified -- that the DEA  
 6 should be notified immediately before a  
 7 suspicious order is shipped, would that be  
 8 accurate?

9 MS. MAINIGI: Objection -- same

10 objections.

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

13 Q. Okay. And would DEA expect  
 14 that a registrant would remain -- excuse me,  
 15 would maintain copies of a suspicious order  
 16 reported to the DEA?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Let's turn then to the next  
 19 tab, which is -- oh, nope, we don't need to  
 20 do that. Never mind.

21 All right. Let's go back to  
 22 the slides we started with.

23 So, Mr. Prevoznik, we went  
 24 through the NWDA suspicious order monitoring  
 25 system, the seminar report that you went over

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 890

1 fails to maintain effective controls to  
 2 prevent diversion; is that correct?  
 3 MR. MAHADY: Objection. Form.  
 4 Objection. Foundation. Calls for a  
 5 legal conclusion.

6 THE WITNESS: Correct.

7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

8 Q. And would it make sense to DEA  
 9 that a registrant could identify an order as  
 10 suspicious, report it to the DEA and then  
 11 send it out to be sold or used?

12 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.

13 Calls for a legal conclusion.

14 THE WITNESS: And not do

15 anything to relieve the suspicion?

16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

17 Q. That's right.

18 A. No, they shouldn't --

19 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.

20 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

21 Q. Can you say your answer again?

22 A. Could you repeat your question?

23 Q. Would it make sense to the DEA  
 24 that a registrant could identify an order as  
 25 suspicious, report it to the DEA, not dispel

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 891

1 their suspicion, and then go ahead and ship  
 2 it so that it could be sold or used?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 4 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Incomplete  
 6 hypothetical. Outside the scope.  
 7 THE WITNESS: No, it would not  
 8 be correct.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. Why?  
 11 A. Because they're not maintaining  
 12 effective controls over diversion.  
 13 MS. MAINIGI: Same objections.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. And what happens if they go  
 16 ahead and just ship that suspicious order?  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Same objections.  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 19 form. Calls for speculation.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Well, it's --  
 21 there was a -- there was a reason it  
 22 triggered the suspicion, so the  
 23 possibility or potential for it to be  
 24 diverted into the illicit market is  
 25 enhanced because it triggered a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 893

1 Objection to foundation.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 4 P38 marked for identification.)  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 6 Q. Now, one of the -- during the  
 7 first or second day of your deposition -- and  
 8 let's turn to your deposition. I'm sure just  
 9 what you want to relive.  
 10 All right. So we'll mark this  
 11 as Exhibit 38.  
 12 And, Mr. Prevoznik, can I  
 13 direct you -- and this is the deposition of  
 14 Tom Prevoznik, April 17, 2019.  
 15 All right. And if you could  
 16 turn to page 171. All right. And I want to  
 17 direct your attention to the middle of the  
 18 page where you testify: "It was a business  
 19 decision on whether to ship or not ship, that  
 20 we, DEA, were not going to direct a  
 21 registrant don't ship or not ship at that  
 22 time."  
 23 Do you see where I am?  
 24 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.  
 25 Form.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 892

1 suspicious order within their system.  
 2 So that being the underlying  
 3 cause for it to be triggered, that --  
 4 the potential for it to be diverted,  
 5 now it's going -- the potential now is  
 6 greater than it's going into the  
 7 public and is going to affect the  
 8 public health and safety.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. Okay. And would going ahead  
 11 and shipping suspicious orders demonstrate an  
 12 attitude of irresponsibility, which I think  
 13 is the language of the Diversion  
 14 Investigators Manual, to the detriment of the  
 15 public health?  
 16 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 17 Outside the scope of Touhy  
 18 authorization. Form.  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. And has that always been true,  
 23 that shipping a suspicious order is a failure  
 24 of effective controls to prevent diversion?  
 25 MR. MAHADY: Objection to form.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 894

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. Okay. And then if you turn the  
 4 page -- I'm sorry. At the bottom of  
 5 page 171, because -- so in 7, it was clear  
 6 that you were now directing registrants: Do  
 7 not ship.  
 8 And you said, right, because of  
 9 the Internet.  
 10 And then there's a question:  
 11 "And prior to December 2007, it was a  
 12 business decision by each registrant  
 13 recognizing what their own obligations were,  
 14 correct?"  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. Have I read that accurately?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. And I just want to be clear.  
 21 Between -- before and after 2007, was it  
 22 always the policy of the DEA that registrants  
 23 could not ship suspicious orders?  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 25 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 895

1 Testimony speaks for itself.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 MR. MAHADY: Foundation.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. And when you talk about a  
 6 change in 2007, you go on to say at the  
 7 bottom of 172, "Well, I don't know if there  
 8 was confusion or not because the -- quite a  
 9 few registrants continue to do what they  
 10 continue to do, which was continue to sell,  
 11 to ignore suspicious orders, and they  
 12 continue to sell huge volumes down the line  
 13 through retail."  
 14 Do you see what I've just read?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. And I've read that accurately?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. And is that the change you're  
 19 referring to in 2007, was DEA's recognition  
 20 that registrants continued to sell suspicious  
 21 orders?  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 23 Testimony speaks for itself.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Yes. Because  
 25 when we met with them in 2005, we

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 897

1 subjective," right?  
 2 Do you see where I am? Towards  
 3 the bottom of the page?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. And then on the next page you  
 6 answered: "WITNESS: Yeah, it can be  
 7 subjective." Top of page 185.  
 8 Do you see where I am?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Okay. And I want to make sure  
 11 that your testimony is clear. When you say  
 12 whether a suspicious order is subjective, do  
 13 you mean that it varies from case to case, or  
 14 it depends on who's looking at it?  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 16 form.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Both, really. It  
 18 depends who's looking at it and  
 19 what system do they have that's  
 20 triggering the suspicious order. So  
 21 it's whatever that registrant  
 22 designed, which is specific to that  
 23 registration.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. Right.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 896

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 898

1 showed them their own data and said,  
 2 "These are the things that we see,  
 3 that we see as very suspicious."  
 4 So we were telling the  
 5 registrants up front, "Look, there is  
 6 a problem. This is what we're  
 7 seeing."  
 8 And then they would say, "Yes,  
 9 we want to be -- we want to fix this."  
 10 And then we continued to see  
 11 those same things continue for some of  
 12 them. Some of them did correct it,  
 13 but some of them continued to go and  
 14 sell those things.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. Okay. And then continuing on  
 17 in your testimony, page 184, you're talking  
 18 in the middle of the page about the  
 19 subjective of shipping, of determining a  
 20 suspicious order.  
 21 Do you see where I am in the  
 22 middle of the page?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. And Cardinal's counsel,  
 25 Ms. Mainigi, asked you: "Because it's

1 But a suspicious order is a  
 2 suspicious order that's an order of unusual  
 3 size -- you can say it better than I can, so  
 4 please go ahead.  
 5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.  
 6 Foundation.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Unusual --  
 8 unusual size, deviating from a --  
 9 substantially deviating from a normal  
 10 pattern, and unusual frequency.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. Okay. And that's universally  
 13 factually true, correct?  
 14 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 15 Foundation. Vague. Outside scope.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Correct. And  
 17 it's disjunctive. So it could be one,  
 18 it could be two, it could be other  
 19 things that we've given guidance on.  
 20 We gave guidance in the  
 21 distributor initiative when we went  
 22 through the various red flags. We put  
 23 them in guidance letters as well -- or  
 24 not guidance, reiteration of the  
 25 regulations in 2006 and 2007 letters

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 899

1 from Mr. Rannazzisi.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. And those criteria don't vary  
 4 from registrant to registrant, correct?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 6 Vague.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. And what differs is whether an  
 10 order triggers a suspicious [sic] based on a  
 11 customer's history, their buying patterns,  
 12 frequency, et cetera, correct?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 14 Vague.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes, as well as  
 16 the registrants, have they made any  
 17 changes to the system.  
 18 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 19 P39 marked for identification.)  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 21 Q. Okay. Let's turn very quickly  
 22 to the industry compliance guidelines.  
 23 All right. I'm going to show  
 24 you what's been marked as Exhibit 39.  
 25 And this is Bates number

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 901

1 due diligence in order to help support the  
 2 security of the controlled substances they  
 3 deliver to their customers."  
 4 Do you see what I've just read?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. And does the DEA agree with  
 7 that statement?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. And did the DEA approve these  
 12 industry compliance guidelines?  
 13 A. No.  
 14 Q. Now, I just want to go through  
 15 some specifics with you very briefly, I hope,  
 16 to see if the DEA agrees that these elements  
 17 comply with the Controlled Substances Act.  
 18 Let's start with Bates number 461.  
 19 Does the DEA agree that a  
 20 registrant should investigate a customer  
 21 before agreeing to ship them controlled  
 22 substances?  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Am I supposed to

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 900

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 902

1 CAH\_MDL2804\_00988458.  
 2 Mr. Prevoznik, have you seen  
 3 this document before?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Okay. And do you recognize  
 6 this to be the Healthcare Distribution  
 7 Management Association's industry compliance  
 8 guidelines?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Okay. And do you know -- I  
 11 don't know if they have a date on them, but  
 12 does it sound right that they were issued in  
 13 2008?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 15 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. Or do you know what year they  
 18 were issued?  
 19 A. I don't know.  
 20 Q. Okay.  
 21 A. I don't know.  
 22 Q. Okay. And if you look at the  
 23 first page, the third paragraph: "At the  
 24 center of a sophisticated supply chain,  
 25 distributors are uniquely situated to perform

1 be looking at something here or --  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. No, just a general statement.  
 4 A. Oh, okay.  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. Do you want me to repeat the  
 8 question, or do you have it?  
 9 A. No. Repeat it.  
 10 Q. Does the DEA agree that a  
 11 registrant should investigate a customer  
 12 before agreeing to ship them controlled  
 13 substances?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 15 THE WITNESS: What do you mean  
 16 by the term "investigate"? Know who  
 17 they are?  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 19 Q. That they should know their  
 20 customer.  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 24 Q. Okay. And in this guide, it  
 25 lays out certain elements, including -- if

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 903

1 you look towards the bottom of the page under  
 2 the information-gathering step, would  
 3 include -- I'm sorry, let's start at the top  
 4 of the page.  
 5 Under the first paragraph,  
 6 Introduction: "Before opening an account" --  
 7 do you see where I am?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. -- "the distributor should,  
 10 one, obtain background information on the  
 11 customer and the customer's business; review  
 12 that information carefully and, where  
 13 appropriate, verify that information; and  
 14 independently investigate the potential  
 15 customer."  
 16 Do you see what I've just read?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. And does the DEA agree that  
 19 those are appropriate and necessary steps for  
 20 a registrant to take before shipping  
 21 controlled substances?  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. Okay. And then moving down the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 905

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. All right. And turning to the  
 5 next page, identify -- bottom bullet:  
 6 "Identification of physicians and other  
 7 treatment centers that are the potential  
 8 customer's most frequent prescribers or  
 9 highest purchasing doctors."  
 10 Do you see where I am?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. And is that something that a  
 13 registrant should be doing as well?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. Okay. Turning to the next  
 18 page, independent investigation, subheading  
 19 D, it says at the first line, "The  
 20 distributor should independently investigate  
 21 the potential customer as follows:" Checking  
 22 with the local DEA office, state oversight  
 23 authorities, DEA website and Federal  
 24 Register, and conducting an Internet search.  
 25 Do you see each of those

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 904

1 page, second bullet talks about a background  
 2 questionnaire.  
 3 Do you see that?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. And that should cover the  
 6 average number of prescriptions filled each  
 7 day, average number of CS item prescriptions  
 8 filled each day.  
 9 Do you see where I am?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. And CS probably means  
 12 controlled substances, yes?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 14 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes. In my  
 16 experience, yes.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. Okay. And then percentage of  
 19 controlled substances purchased compared to  
 20 overall purchases?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Would the DEA agree that those  
 23 are things that a registrant should be  
 24 looking at before shipping controlled  
 25 substances to a new customer?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 906

1 elements?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. And does the DEA agree that  
 4 those are things that a responsible  
 5 registrant should be doing before shipping  
 6 controlled substances to a customer?  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.  
 8 Foundation. Vague.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. And merely checking to see  
 12 whether a customer has a DEA registration,  
 13 would that be sufficient due diligence or  
 14 knowing your customer?  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 16 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 17 THE WITNESS: No.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 19 Q. And it says here under  
 20 Additional Recommendations and Documentation,  
 21 the third bullet, "The performance and  
 22 results of all steps in the customer review  
 23 process should be fully documented as to each  
 24 potential customer, and such documentation  
 25 should be retained in an appropriate file."

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 907

1 Do you see what I've just read?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. And does the DEA also agree  
 4 that that is an appropriate element, that  
 5 documenting due diligence or knowing your  
 6 customer is an appropriate element of that  
 7 program?  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 9 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. All right. Turning to 465, so  
 13 two pages ahead, you see the section Develop  
 14 Thresholds to Identify Orders of Interest?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Okay. So it says here that  
 17 distributors -- I'm down at the second set of  
 18 bullets, the bottom bullet: "Thresholds for  
 19 all new customer accounts should be  
 20 established at the lowest level indicated by  
 21 information obtained during the know your  
 22 customer due diligence review."  
 23 Do you see where I've just  
 24 read?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 909

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. And the registrant should be  
 3 making its own judgment about what is not  
 4 suspicious for a particular customer and not  
 5 just accepting what they've previously  
 6 ordered, correct?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 8 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. And they shouldn't be building  
 12 in some excess above that level, correct?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 14 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. All right. And then looking at  
 18 the section Cumulative Reviews/Thresholds,  
 19 the industry compliance guidelines also  
 20 indicate that "there should be a mechanism to  
 21 compare percentages of orders for controlled  
 22 substances, individual products and/or  
 23 families to orders of noncontrolled substance  
 24 prescription drugs so as to identify a shift  
 25 in a customer's business focus that may

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 908

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 910

1 Q. And does the DEA agree that  
 2 that is appropriate?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 4 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 5 THE WITNESS: I guess my  
 6 concern would be that if you're --  
 7 what is the lowest level? Is it what  
 8 the customer is reporting what they  
 9 said they ordered or is it -- you  
 10 know, it could be like really a large  
 11 amount, or is the registrant saying  
 12 this is what we are going to say is  
 13 the lowest amount.  
 14 So I have a little trouble with  
 15 that one.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. Okay. So just making sure that  
 18 we get this clear for the jury, the amount  
 19 that a customer reports may be too high,  
 20 correct?  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Incomplete  
 24 hypothetical.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

1 warranty further review."  
 2 Do you see what I've just read?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. And does the DEA agree that a  
 5 registrant should not just be looking at a  
 6 customer's controlled substances orders but  
 7 their controlled substance orders relative to  
 8 other products they're ordering?  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 10 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. All right. And then Bates  
 14 number 466 under E, the last sentence:  
 15 "Based on the distributor's knowledge of his  
 16 or her customer's overall drug purchasing  
 17 trends, information available from DEA and  
 18 elsewhere, distributors are encouraged to  
 19 allow for alternative criteria, in addition  
 20 to those incorporated into the electronic  
 21 system, to serve as indicators of an order of  
 22 interest."  
 23 Do you see what I've just read?  
 24 A. Yes.  
 25 Q. And is it DEA's view that --

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 911

1 and I think you testified to this earlier --  
 2 that a registrant should be looking at other  
 3 indicators of suspicion, not just an order  
 4 history? Correct?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. And is the DEA aware that  
 9 distributors have sales representatives or  
 10 account managers who visit pharmacies, for  
 11 instance?  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 13 Foundation.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Scope.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. And should distributors be  
 18 looking at the -- should they be  
 19 incorporating or factoring the observations  
 20 of their account managers or sales reps into  
 21 their evaluation of customers and their  
 22 orders?  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 24 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 25 Foundation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 913

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 2 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 3 MR. MAHADY: Foundation.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 6 Q. All right. Next page, the top  
 7 of the page: "It's recommended that the  
 8 distributor designate a person with suitable  
 9 training and experience to investigate orders  
 10 of interest."  
 11 Do you see what I've just read?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. And does the DEA agree that a  
 14 registrant should have appropriately trained  
 15 and experienced compliance staff executing  
 16 its suspicious order monitoring and due  
 17 diligence process?  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Foundation.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. All right. Bates number 468,  
 24 subsection D, Documentation, it says under  
 25 that, "All investigations should be fully

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 912

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 914

1 THE WITNESS: Yes. But I would  
 2 also -- they're drivers as well,  
 3 because it's on a daily basis they're  
 4 in the pharmacies.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 6 Q. Okay. All right. And then  
 7 looking at the bottom of the page, still at  
 8 Bates number 466, "The drug or drugs that  
 9 cause an order to become an order of interest  
 10 should not be shipped to the customer placing  
 11 the order while the order is an order of  
 12 interest."  
 13 Do you see what I've just read  
 14 there?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. And do you understand that to  
 17 be saying that while an order is being  
 18 evaluated as to whether it's suspicious, it  
 19 should not be shipped?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. And it -- again, that is the --  
 24 that is what the Controlled Substances Act  
 25 requires, correct?

1 documented, and all records of the  
 2 investigation should be retained in an  
 3 appropriate location within the firm, such as  
 4 with other records relating to the particular  
 5 customer."  
 6 Does the DEA agree with that  
 7 element of a compliant suspicious order  
 8 monitoring program?  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 10 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. And in the middle of the next  
 14 paragraph: "The documentation should include  
 15 a clear statement of the final conclusion of  
 16 the investigation, including why the order  
 17 investigated was or was not determined to be  
 18 suspicious. That statement should be signed  
 19 and dated by the reviewer. Copies of any  
 20 written information provided by the customer  
 21 should also be retained as part of the  
 22 documentation of the investigation."  
 23 Does the DEA agree that's  
 24 appropriate?  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 915

1 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. All right. Very last paragraph  
 5 on that page, "Orders that are determined to  
 6 be suspicious should be reported to DEA under  
 7 Section 1301.74(b) immediately upon being so  
 8 determined."  
 9 I think you've already  
 10 testified that that's a requirement, correct?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. "It is assumed that the order  
 15 will continue to be placed on hold and/or  
 16 canceled once it has been identified as  
 17 suspicious."  
 18 Is that also consistent with  
 19 the DEA's interpretation of the Controlled  
 20 Substance Act's requirements?  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 22 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. Now, if the -- if an order is

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 917

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. And should the registrant be  
 3 shipping that the next month?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 5 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. Without first dispelling the  
 8 suspicion?  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 10 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 11 Incomplete hypothetical.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Yes, they should  
 13 be relieving -- or ascertaining is  
 14 there suspicion or not.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. And not shipping unless they  
 17 eliminate the basis for that suspicion?  
 18 A. Correct.  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 20 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 21 Incomplete hypothetical.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. 469, sub F, Future Customer  
 24 Orders. "In instances where a distributor  
 25 concludes that an order is or remains

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 916

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 918

1 identified as suspicious and not shipped but  
 2 held and then released the next month when a  
 3 threshold is reset, does the DEA believe that  
 4 the registrant is still shipping a suspicious  
 5 order?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 7 Calls for a legal conclusion and  
 8 incomplete hypothetical.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the  
 10 scope.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 12 repeat that?  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. Now, if an order is identified  
 15 as suspicious and not shipped but then held,  
 16 you know, not shipped, held until the next  
 17 month when a threshold resets, is that order  
 18 still suspicious?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 20 Calls for a legal conclusion and  
 21 incomplete hypothetical.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 23 hypothetical.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 25

1 suspicious after conducting an investigation,  
 2 in addition to notifying DEA, it is  
 3 recommended that the distributor evaluate its  
 4 business relationship with the customer that  
 5 placed that order."  
 6 Do you see what I've just read?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. "The distributor may consider  
 9 whether to subject future orders from that  
 10 same customer -- from that same customer for  
 11 the same drug code product or all controlled  
 12 substances to more rigorous scrutiny than was  
 13 applied before the determination that the  
 14 order is suspicious. The distributor may  
 15 also consider whether to cease filling all  
 16 future orders of that drug product code or  
 17 all controlled substances placed by that  
 18 customer."  
 19 Does the DEA agree that when a  
 20 registrant identifies a suspicious order,  
 21 they should also be looking more generally at  
 22 that customer?  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 24 form.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 919

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. And making a decision as to not  
 3 only whether to fill that order but to  
 4 continue filling orders for that customer?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 6 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. All right. Bottom of page 469.  
 10 An endless document for one so short. It  
 11 says at the bottom bullet, "For example, the  
 12 distributor may identify information that  
 13 leads them to believe that a potential  
 14 customer, prior to entering a formal business  
 15 arrangement with that customer, may  
 16 intend" -- on the next page -- "to order  
 17 controlled substances -- controlled substance  
 18 products with a frequency, volume or other  
 19 indicator that could be considered  
 20 suspicious. In such instances, the  
 21 distributor should provide DEA with a report  
 22 of this information under 21 CFR  
 23 Section 1301.74(b)."   
 24 Do you see what I've just read?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 921

1 THE WITNESS: Well, we have two  
 2 different things going on. We have  
 3 those that report to the field and  
 4 those that have been under an action  
 5 that is now dictated to go through  
 6 electronically to headquarters.  
 7 So, yes, if it's going to the  
 8 office, that would be a great way to  
 9 do it, to track that.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. Okay. And that C,  
 12 Documentation, "All additional contact with  
 13 DEA, either by telephone or in person, should  
 14 be documented, and a record of the contact  
 15 should be maintained."  
 16 Does the DEA agree with that?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. And is it fair to say that the  
 19 DEA would agree that a registrant should be  
 20 maintaining records of suspicious orders they  
 21 report to the DEA?  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 23 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 24 Foundation.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 920

1 Q. And would the DEA agree that if  
 2 a distributor is evaluating a potential  
 3 customer, sees indications that it may be  
 4 engaged in diversion, it is not sufficient  
 5 for the distributor to simply not do business  
 6 with that customer, but that they should also  
 7 be reporting that customer -- that potential  
 8 customer to the DEA?  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 10 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. All right. Subsection B on  
 14 Bates number 470, under Correspondence For  
 15 Reporting, "It is recommended that all  
 16 correspondence to DEA containing reports of  
 17 suspicious orders should be sent registered  
 18 mail with a return receipt requested, by  
 19 electronic mail or by another system that  
 20 creates for the distributor a permanent  
 21 record that DEA has received the  
 22 notification."  
 23 Does the DEA agree with that?  
 24 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 25 form.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 922

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. So while registrants, in going  
 3 through all of these different elements of  
 4 the industry compliance guidelines, which  
 5 we're now thankfully finished with, would the  
 6 DEA agree that whatever suspicious order  
 7 monitoring algorithm or system that a  
 8 registrant uses, that all of these elements  
 9 we just went through are elements of a  
 10 responsible and compliant program to prevent  
 11 diversion?  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 13 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. All right.  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Why don't we  
 18 take a five-minute break.  
 19 MS. SINGER: Can I do one more  
 20 document that connects with this and  
 21 then --  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay. One  
 23 more.  
 24 MS. SINGER: Thank you.  
 25 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 923

1 P40 marked for identification.)  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. All right. Mr. Prevoznik,  
 4 Exhibit 40 is entitled "Draft DEA Comments  
 5 From the 6-04-08 Meeting on Suspicious  
 6 Orders." It's Bates number  
 7 CAH\_MDL2804\_03234535.  
 8 Have you seen this document?  
 9 A. No.  
 10 Q. Okay. Do you see here at the  
 11 top of the document a list of DEA attendees?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. And do you recognize those to  
 14 be people who have worked for the DEA?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Okay. And do you recognize the  
 17 HDMA attendees? Somebody from Williams &  
 18 Connolly, people identified as with HDMA?  
 19 A. I don't recognize the names.  
 20 Q. Okay. All right. If you go  
 21 down to the middle of the page, P.4,  
 22 Item 1.B, it says, "DEA was pleased to see  
 23 that the questionnaire would be notarized or  
 24 provided with the statement declaring that it  
 25 is true and correct. DEA does not want

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 925

1 this document, which is Bates number 536, it  
 2 says, "DEA seemed to think that, quote,  
 3 thresholds, focus principally on volumes, and  
 4 they express the view that an exclusive or  
 5 even principal focus on volumes is  
 6 inadequate."  
 7 Is that consistent with the  
 8 testimony you've given that just using volume  
 9 thresholds aren't sufficient to identify  
 10 suspicious orders?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: The portion  
 12 you read isn't in front of the  
 13 witness.  
 14 Do you know where she's reading  
 15 from?  
 16 THE WITNESS: No.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. I'm sorry. It's the bottom of  
 19 page 536, the underscored language.  
 20 MS. FUMERTON: Object to form.  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 22 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 23 Vague.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Sorry, can you  
 25 repeat it?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 924

1 changes but wants us to be aware that merely  
 2 obtaining a signed document isn't going to be  
 3 enough of a defense. Distributors will have  
 4 to do more to identify the pharmacy's  
 5 legitimacy."  
 6 Do you understand what this is  
 7 referring to?  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 9 Foundation. Outside the scope of the  
 10 Touhy authorization.  
 11 THE WITNESS: I don't know what  
 12 question they're talking about.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. Okay. Would the DEA agree that  
 15 in addition to completing a question --  
 16 having a potential customer complete a  
 17 questionnaire before a registrant agrees to  
 18 ship them a controlled substance, that a  
 19 registrant has to verify that the answers to  
 20 that questionnaire are accurate and complete?  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 22 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. And then turning to page 2 of

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 926

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Yeah.  
 3 Do you agree with that first  
 4 underlined sentence, "DEA seemed to think the  
 5 thresholds focus principally on volumes, and  
 6 they express the view that an exclusive or  
 7 even principal focus on volumes is  
 8 inadequate"?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Okay. They also want the  
 11 initial screen of orders to focus on, "A,  
 12 patterns of ordering, comparing the present  
 13 order to the past orders from the same  
 14 customers, including whether the frequency of  
 15 orders is suspicious; 2, orders are from  
 16 similar customers; and, 3, orders from the --  
 17 from other establishments of the same type in  
 18 the locale or region; and on, B, combinations  
 19 of controlled substances ordered."  
 20 Does DEA agree that that is  
 21 also a necessary element of monitoring for  
 22 suspicious orders?  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 24 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not --

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 927

1 the word "necessary," I mean, it's  
 2 very important. It's part of the  
 3 criteria that should be included.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. Okay. And then on Bates  
 6 number 538, looking at the highlighted  
 7 language toward the bottom of the page: "In  
 8 general" --  
 9 I want to make sure you see  
 10 where I am.  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. -- "DEA did not object to our  
 13 recommendation that the particular drug or  
 14 drugs that cause an order to be an order of  
 15 interest or a suspicious order should not be  
 16 shipped but other drugs can be. Their point  
 17 was that in some circumstances the connection  
 18 between that drug and another drug in the  
 19 order should lead the wholesaler not to ship  
 20 the other drug as well. Again, in their  
 21 view, looking at a volume order drug by drug  
 22 is not enough, and basing thresholds solely  
 23 on volume is not enough. Even an order for a  
 24 drug that does not meet a volume threshold  
 25 may be suspicious in light of other aspects

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 929

1 form. Foundation. Calls for  
 2 speculation.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 4 Foundation.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 6 speculation.  
 7 MS. SINGER: You know what?  
 8 Withdrawn. Don't answer that.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. The next bullet, "They wanted  
 11 reports on all suspicious orders even if the  
 12 order was not shipped."  
 13 Does the DEA agree that  
 14 registrants should be reporting all  
 15 suspicious orders, even orders that aren't  
 16 shipped?  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 18 form. Calls for speculation. Calls  
 19 for a legal conclusion.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. "Timeliness is very important.  
 23 DEA wants us to emphasize the need for rapid,  
 24 timely reporting."  
 25 Is that a point that DEA made

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 928

1 of the order."  
 2 Does DEA agree with that  
 3 statement?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 5 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. Okay. And then the final  
 9 section of this document, Bates number 539,  
 10 if you look at the bullets on the bottom of  
 11 the page, additional comments/points raised.  
 12 Do you see where I am?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. "DEA was emphatic that if there  
 15 were questions about an order, the order  
 16 should not be shipped."  
 17 Do you agree with that  
 18 statement?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 20 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. And why do you think the  
 24 "should not" is underscored there?  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Object to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 930

1 clear to registrants?  
 2 MR. MAHADY: Objection to form.  
 3 Objection to foundation.  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Calls for  
 5 speculation.  
 6 THE WITNESS: It's also  
 7 regulation upon discovery, so it's  
 8 immediately upon discovery.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. So that's a yes?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 MS. SINGER: Okay. All right.  
 13 Let's take a break.  
 14 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off  
 15 record. The time is 10:30.  
 16 (Off the record at 10:30 a.m.)  
 17 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back  
 18 on the record. Beginning of Media  
 19 File 3. The time is 10:45.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Before we  
 21 resume, I just have a request of the  
 22 parties and of the special master as  
 23 well.  
 24 Since it appears that we are  
 25 deferring argument over the scope of

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 931

1 the Touhy authorization until sometime  
 2 later, we would ask that we be copied  
 3 on briefings regarding the scope of  
 4 the Touhy authorization and that we be  
 5 given an opportunity to respond.  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Fine with us.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And I ask  
 8 that those be e-mailed directly to  
 9 James Bennett.  
 10 MR. BENNETT: That's fine.  
 11 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: So  
 12 stipulated.  
 13 MS. SINGER: All right. Are we  
 14 ready?  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. All right. Mr. Prevoznik, on  
 17 the one hand, industry has complained that  
 18 you didn't give -- you, the DEA, didn't give  
 19 them enough guidance or the right kind of  
 20 guidance on identifying suspicious orders,  
 21 but then one of the lawyers in your first two  
 22 days of deposition suggested that the  
 23 Rannazzisi letters, those 2006, 2007 letters,  
 24 were improper and should have gone through a  
 25 rulemaking process.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 933

1 suspicious orders but also said that the  
 2 Rannazzisi letters were improper because they  
 3 didn't go through a rulemaking process, are  
 4 you able to reconcile those positions?  
 5 What should DEA have done?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 8 Outside the scope of the Touhy  
 9 authorization. Improper hypothetical.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'll join the  
 11 scope objection.  
 12 You can answer if you  
 13 understand.  
 14 THE WITNESS: I'm still not  
 15 sure what you're asking.  
 16 MS. SINGER: Okay. Skip it.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. Okay. Let me ask it  
 19 differently.  
 20 Did the Rannazzisi letters, the  
 21 2006, 2007 letters, change the obligations of  
 22 registrants?  
 23 A. No.  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 25 Calls for a legal conclusion.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 932

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 934

1 Do you remember what I'm  
 2 referring to?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 4 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. Okay. Is DEA able to swear  
 8 these positions, that you didn't give enough  
 9 guidance, but you also should have given more  
 10 guidance? I just said the same thing.  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. Is the DEA able to swear those  
 14 positions, that the guidance you gave was  
 15 improper but you should have given more  
 16 guidance?  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 18 Vague.  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the scope  
 20 also.  
 21 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what  
 22 you're asking me.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 24 Q. So when industry complains you  
 25 didn't give them enough guidance on

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Did they reflect a new policy  
 3 or interpretation by DEA?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 5 form.  
 6 THE WITNESS: No, we were just  
 7 being more proactive to get the  
 8 registrants to see this was what was  
 9 going on. That's why we did the  
 10 distributor initiatives, to show them  
 11 with their own data, these are the  
 12 anomalies that we were seeing and  
 13 explaining to them this is what we  
 14 saw, and you should be paying  
 15 attention to these as well.  
 16 So the guidance letter -- or  
 17 not the guidance. The reiteration of  
 18 what their legal obligations were,  
 19 both statutorily and regulatory, were  
 20 in those letters, and it was to stop  
 21 what was going on at that time.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. And "stop" meaning the --  
 24 A. The diversion of controlled  
 25 substances into the illicit market.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 935

1 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 2 P41 marked for identification.)  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. Okay. Showing you Exhibit 41.  
 5 Do you recognize this, Mr. Prevoznik, as one  
 6 of Joe Rannazzisi's letters from  
 7 September 27, 2006?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. And turn to page 3 of that  
 10 letter, please.  
 11 Do you see a heading at the top  
 12 of the page, Circumstances That Might Be  
 13 Indicative of Diversion?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. And does this letter then go  
 16 through a list of ten factors that  
 17 registrants might look to determine  
 18 whether an order is suspicious?  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Are you talking  
 21 the middle 10 or the four above it?  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. The 1 through 4 -- I'm sorry,  
 24 and then 1 through 10, so a total of 14.  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 937

1 THE WITNESS: Well, I mean,  
 2 it's -- our job as DEA is as a  
 3 regulatory and as a law enforcement,  
 4 is to ensure that the right -- that  
 5 it's staying within the closest in the  
 6 distribution. So that's -- our job is  
 7 to investigate, detect and pro -- and  
 8 detect where this might be occurring.  
 9 So, I mean, that's what our job is.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. Okay. So let me ask it  
 12 slightly differently.  
 13 In your experience, did these  
 14 companies have lawyers and lobbyists to help  
 15 them explain the rules for preventing  
 16 diversion and reporting suspicious orders?  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 18 Calls for speculation. Foundation.  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the  
 20 scope.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. And do you think, does DEA  
 24 think, that the industry's failure to comply  
 25 with the Controlled Substances Act was due to

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 936

1 Q. Your math is better than mine.  
 2 And does this, in fact, reflect  
 3 information, clarification, that DEA provided  
 4 to registrants to help them identify  
 5 suspicious orders?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Okay.  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. All right. Now, many of the  
 11 registrants represented by counsel here are  
 12 sophisticated, multi-billion dollar  
 13 companies; is that correct?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Object to form.  
 16 Scope.  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Hang on.  
 18 I'll join the scope objection.  
 19 You can answer.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 21 Q. Does DEA believe that they  
 22 needed DEA to explain the rules to them?  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 24 Argumentative.  
 25 MS. MAINIGI: Scope.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 938

1 a failure to understand what the law required  
 2 of them?  
 3 MR. MAHADY: Objection. Form.  
 4 MS. MAINIGI: Foundation.  
 5 Scope.  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Calls  
 7 for a legal conclusion.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 9 speculation.  
 10 THE WITNESS: No.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. And do you think that  
 13 industry's failure to comply with the  
 14 Controlled Substances Act and maintain -- and  
 15 the failure to maintain effective controls  
 16 was due to -- I'm sorry, let me say that  
 17 again.  
 18 Do you think that industry's  
 19 failure to maintain effective controls to  
 20 prevent diversion was based on a lack of  
 21 recognition that diversion imperils public  
 22 health and safety?  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 24 Foundation. Calls for a legal  
 25 conclusion.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 939

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
2 speculation.  
3 THE WITNESS: Can you please  
4 repeat it?  
5 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
6 Q. Yeah. I'll put it differently.  
7 Do you think that the reason  
8 that the industry didn't comply with the  
9 rules is because they didn't understand what  
10 would happen if they permitted the diversion  
11 of controlled substances?  
12 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
13 Calls for speculation.  
14 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the scope  
15 of the Touhy authorization.  
16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
17 speculation.  
18 THE WITNESS: Can you give it  
19 to me one more time? I'm just having  
20 a little hard time interpreting.  
21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
22 Q. Do you think that industry  
23 failed to understand that permitting the  
24 diversion of controlled substances  
25 jeopardizes public health and safety?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 941

1 closed system is to prevent diversion and  
2 protect public safety and the public  
3 interest?  
4 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
5 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
6 form. Outside the scope of the Touhy  
7 authorization.  
8 Special Master Cohen, I do  
9 think that this entire line of  
10 questioning where somehow the DEA is  
11 supposed to define what industry was  
12 thinking in some broad sense is  
13 totally improper.  
14 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Calls  
15 for speculation.  
16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Join the  
17 speculation objection.  
18 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN:  
19 Eventually there will be an  
20 admissibility ruling on this. I'm not  
21 going to preclude the questions from  
22 being asked at this juncture.  
23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
24 Q. Did you answer the question,  
25 that --

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 940

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 942

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
2 Calls for speculation. Scope.  
3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
4 objection.  
5 THE WITNESS: Yes, I would  
6 agree that they didn't.  
7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
8 Q. And put a different way,  
9 because I've got a lot of negatives in there,  
10 do you think industry understood that  
11 diversion leads to negative consequences for  
12 public health and safety?  
13 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
14 Calls for speculation. Legal  
15 conclusion. Scope.  
16 MS. MAINIGI: Foundation.  
17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
18 speculation.  
19 THE WITNESS: I think they  
20 obviously do now. I don't know at  
21 that time that they realized how bad  
22 it was getting.  
23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
24 Q. But they did understand that  
25 the purpose of the controlled -- of the

1 A. I'm not sure if I answered or  
2 not.  
3 Q. Okay. Let me ask one more.  
4 Is the -- did the DEA, in the  
5 Controlled Substances Act, make clear to  
6 industry that the failure to prevent  
7 diversion was a threat to public safety and  
8 the public interest?  
9 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
10 Foundation.  
11 THE WITNESS: Yes, I think it's  
12 established in 823 where it's part of  
13 our -- part of the registrant that is  
14 applying to be a registrant  
15 understands that they have to maintain  
16 effective controls. They have to  
17 follow the state laws. They have to  
18 not be convicted of, you know,  
19 felonies or anything like that.  
20 But also they also know that  
21 these drugs themselves are scheduled  
22 controlled substances for a particular  
23 reason, because they're addictive,  
24 psychologically and physically they're  
25 addictive, so they know that these

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 943

1 drugs have these properties within  
 2 themselves.  
 3 So they would understand that  
 4 these drugs are categorized or  
 5 scheduled in that manner because they  
 6 have the potential to hurt.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: For what it's  
 8 worth, the witness said 823, not E 23.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. Now, you were asked in the  
 11 first two days of your deposition some  
 12 questions about whether DEA implicitly or  
 13 explicitly approved of distributors'  
 14 compliance programs.  
 15 Do you remember that line of  
 16 questioning?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Okay. And you testified that  
 19 if the DEA found problems, like not reporting  
 20 suspicious orders, you would let the  
 21 registrant know they needed to make  
 22 adjustments; is that correct?  
 23 A. Now, I don't understand that  
 24 that's the totality of what I stated.  
 25 Q. Okay. So --

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 945

1 they ask -- or we hear something that  
 2 doesn't sound quite right, we would  
 3 offer and say, "Well, you might want  
 4 to look at this."  
 5 Sort of exactly like the  
 6 Rannazzisi letters in which we laid  
 7 out the foundation of these are the  
 8 things that we're seeing. We're  
 9 having trouble trying to figure out  
 10 why this is going on. So we're asking  
 11 you to ask the same questions of  
 12 yourselves of the data that you're  
 13 seeing.  
 14 So what we're trying to do is  
 15 we're trying to put people in  
 16 compliance so that this stops, that  
 17 the diversion stops. So, yes, we  
 18 would -- we would offer suggestions to  
 19 them.  
 20 However, if we're into an  
 21 investigation or something where it --  
 22 where we are either investigating or  
 23 litigating, that might -- that  
 24 conversation might slow down.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 944

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 946

1 MR. EPPICH: Well, let me  
 2 object to it misstates prior  
 3 testimony, please.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. Okay. So would the DEA let a  
 6 registrant know if it was aware of problems  
 7 with its suspicious order monitoring system?  
 8 MS. MAINIG: Objection.  
 9 Vague. Form. Foundation.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 11 hypothetical.  
 12 MS. MAINIG: And time period.  
 13 THE WITNESS: So how I would  
 14 respond to this particular question is  
 15 when we sit down with a registrant and  
 16 they're explaining their system to us,  
 17 we are in a listening mode. We are  
 18 listening to what they say: "This is  
 19 what we're going to do. This is how  
 20 we're going to implement it. These  
 21 are the thresholds. These are the" --  
 22 whatever. They're explaining the  
 23 system to us, so we listen to what  
 24 they're saying.  
 25 If we, in listening to that,

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Understood.  
 3 And the fact that DEA doesn't  
 4 alert a registrant to a problem with their  
 5 suspicious order monitoring program doesn't  
 6 mean the problem doesn't exist, does it?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 8 Calls for speculation. Calls for a  
 9 legal conclusion.  
 10 MS. FUMERTON: And lack of  
 11 foundation.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. Yes. Okay.  
 15 So, for instance, if I turn in  
 16 my taxes and the IRS cashes the check and  
 17 doesn't send me an audit letter, it doesn't  
 18 mean that they've approved of a tax shelter  
 19 that I may have?  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 21 Incomplete hypothetical form.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. Not that I do.  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 25 Incomplete hypothetical.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 947

1 MS. FUMERTON: Outside the  
2 scope.  
3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
4 Unless you're talking about my taxes.  
5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
7 Q. Okay. So you testified, too,  
8 that things can look good on paper or look  
9 fine on paper, but what matters is how they  
10 work in practice, correct?  
11 MR. EPPICH: Objection to the  
12 extent it misstates prior testimony.  
13 THE WITNESS: Well, the  
14 regulations require two things:  
15 design and operate. So the design  
16 would be this is what we propose, this  
17 is what our system looks like, and  
18 then becomes, well, what, in fact, did  
19 you do with the operation of it.  
20 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
21 Q. Okay. And you, the DEA, can't  
22 always see what distributors don't do or do  
23 wrong, especially if they're trying not to be  
24 caught, correct?  
25 MR. EPPICH: Object to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 949

1 Q. And if you go down towards the  
2 bottom of the page, there's a paragraph that  
3 begins with "Gary Boggs, special agent with  
4 the DEA's Office of Diversion Control."  
5 Do you see where I am?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. And do you know who Gary Boggs  
8 is?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. And who is Gary Boggs?  
11 A. He was one of the assistants to  
12 Joe Rannazzisi when Joe was the head of the  
13 diversion program.  
14 Q. Okay. And this article, if you  
15 look at page 1, is dated 2012.  
16 Do you know if Gary Boggs was  
17 with DEA in 2012?  
18 Or it identifies him here as a  
19 special agent with DEA's Office of Diversion  
20 Control.  
21 A. Yeah, I'm just trying to think,  
22 because I got to headquarters in 2012, so he  
23 was there for part of it, but I think he may  
24 have -- not 100 percent, but he may have  
25 retired towards the end of the year.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 948

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 950

1 form. Foundation.  
2 MS. MAINIGI: Incomplete  
3 hypothetical and outside the scope.  
4 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
5 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
6 P42 marked for identification.)  
7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
8 Q. Okay. I want to turn to  
9 Exhibit 42.  
10 It is Exhibit Number 7 to the  
11 Boggs deposition. It's called "American  
12 Pain: The Largest US Pill Mill's Rise and  
13 Fall."  
14 Have you seen this article  
15 before?  
16 A. I don't -- I don't know of this  
17 one in particular. I've seen a lot of  
18 articles.  
19 Q. Okay. And I want you to turn  
20 to the -- I don't know if it's tabbed on your  
21 copy, but page -- the page that starts  
22 "Harvard Drug" on the top. I think it's the  
23 fifth page.  
24 Do you see that page?  
25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Okay. So it says here, "Gary  
2 Boggs, special agent with the DEA's Office of  
3 Diversion Control, says the cases that the  
4 DEA has brought in recent years involved  
5 wholesalers knowingly making enormous sales  
6 to customers that were per se in violation of  
7 DEA's rules."  
8 Do you see where I'm reading?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. And does the DEA agree with  
11 that statement?  
12 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
13 form. Foundation. Scope.  
14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
16 Q. And then it goes on quoting  
17 Mr. Boggs, "The notion put out by HDMA that  
18 somehow or another the DEA is not providing  
19 essential information to them is simply not  
20 accurate, says Boggs. It's a smokescreen.  
21 It's a step out of desperation."  
22 Do you see that statement?  
23 A. Yes.  
24 Q. Okay. Do you agree with that  
25 statement?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 951

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection to the  
 2 form. Scope. Foundation.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to the  
 4 form.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 6 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 7 P43 marked for identification.)  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. All right. Moving to the next  
 10 exhibit.  
 11 By the way, do you know what  
 12 Gary Boggs does now?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 14 Calls for speculation.  
 15 THE WITNESS: He works for  
 16 McKesson.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. All right. Exhibit 43,  
 19 Mr. Prevoznik.  
 20 This is MCKMDL00661483.  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Can I get  
 22 another copy of this, please?  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 24 Q. All right. And this is an  
 25 e-mail Re: Report on House Energy and

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 953

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Do you know if that might be  
 3 Cardinal Health?  
 4 A. It could be.  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 6 Foundation.  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the  
 8 scope.  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Asked and  
 10 answered.  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Ms. Singer, we  
 12 would appreciate it if you were not  
 13 testifying.  
 14 MS. SINGER: I don't think I  
 15 was.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. -- "has blown them off to the  
 18 point that the DEA is now hammering all of  
 19 us."  
 20 Does this accurately reflect  
 21 the sense of the -- is it true that the DEA  
 22 felt that the industry did not respond to  
 23 their guidance and request for compliance?  
 24 MR. MAHADY: Objection. Form.  
 25 Objection. Foundation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 952

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 954

1 Commerce Subcommittee Hearing on DEA and FDA  
 2 Transparency.  
 3 And I'll direct you to the  
 4 middle of the e-mail from Ann Berkey.  
 5 Do you see where I am?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Okay. And it's dated Tuesday,  
 8 April 8, 2014.  
 9 And if you look in the text of  
 10 that e-mail, it says, "I met today with Gary  
 11 Boggs, the new senior director of reg affairs  
 12 for US pharma for the east of the Mississippi  
 13 River, that is, who is based in Livonia.  
 14 He's a former top official with the DEA, and  
 15 we talked extensively about this bill, the  
 16 hearing, ways we can work with the Agency, et  
 17 cetera. He outlined in some detail the  
 18 processes that the DEA has had in place for  
 19 years to, quote, collaborate with wholesalers  
 20 in the way in which our industry, CAH" --  
 21 Do you know what CAH refers to?  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 23 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 24 THE WITNESS: No, I don't.  
 25

1 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the  
 2 scope.  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 4 Calls for speculation. No foundation.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague as to  
 6 time.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. And this is as of 2014,  
 10 correct?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 12 Foundation. Misstates the document.  
 13 Form.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's the  
 15 date on the e-mail.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. All right. Turn to the next  
 18 page, please. It says, towards the top, "Per  
 19 our discussion with Rep Burgess."  
 20 Do you see where I am?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. "Per our discussion with Rep  
 23 Burgess on Saturday, his office called me  
 24 this afternoon before the hearing and asked  
 25 me for questions he could ask DEA." Stop

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 955

1 there.  
 2 Now, do you know who Ann Berkey  
 3 is?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Calls  
 5 for speculation.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. No?  
 8 A. No.  
 9 Q. Okay. Were you aware that the  
 10 HDA was providing questions to members of  
 11 Congress, or Representative Burgess in  
 12 particular, to ask DEA at an upcoming  
 13 hearing?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 15 Foundation. Scope. Form.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'll join the  
 17 scope objection.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Me personally,  
 19 no, I did not know that.  
 20 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 21 P44 marked for identification.)  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. Okay. Next exhibit.  
 24 Okay. Exhibit 44. This is  
 25 ABDCMDL00139028.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 957

1 A. Yes.  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. -- "the executive assistant to  
 5 the deputy administrator for diversion  
 6 control, led this response. He stated that  
 7 DEA's single greatest concern was their  
 8 belief that wholesaler distributors were lax  
 9 in analysis, review and acting on their own  
 10 ARCOS data. He stated that sometimes the  
 11 data were pretty egregious. He went on to  
 12 explain, "turning the page, "that the Agency  
 13 had not seen changes in registrants' behavior  
 14 that it expected after presenting its  
 15 analysis of ARCOS data to them, so we have --  
 16 quote, 'so we have upped our game.'"  
 17 Is this consistent with the  
 18 DEA's view and your testimony that  
 19 registrants were lax in their analysis,  
 20 review and acting on their own ARCOS data?  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 22 Misstates testimony. Foundation.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. And was it pretty egregious?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 956

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 958

1 It's called Summary of DEA HDMA  
 2 meeting, December 19, 2011.  
 3 Do you recall a meeting between  
 4 the DEA and HDMA in 2011?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 6 Foundation.  
 7 THE WITNESS: I don't.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. The DEA did meet with the HDMA  
 10 periodically, correct?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 12 Foundation.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. Okay. And down at the bottom  
 16 of the page here, in the last paragraph, it  
 17 says, "HDMA asked if there was any -- if  
 18 there were any noncompliance trends  
 19 throughout the wholesale distribution  
 20 industry we should inform our members about."  
 21 Do you see where I am?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. Okay. "Gary Boggs" --  
 24 Who we talked about just a  
 25 minute ago, correct?

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 2 Foundation.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Vague.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 6 Q. And when it says here that DEA  
 7 had "upped its game," do you know what that's  
 8 referring to?  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 10 Foundation.  
 11 MS. MAINIGI: Outside scope.  
 12 THE WITNESS: At this time  
 13 period, we were investigating and  
 14 litigating against the wholesalers.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. Okay. Prompted by DEA's sense  
 17 that that's what they needed to do given a  
 18 lack of voluntarily compliance, correct?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 20 form. Misstates testimony.  
 21 Foundation.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 24 P45 marked for identification.)  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 959

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Exhibit 45. This is  
 3 CAH\_MDL2804\_01530082. And I'll represent  
 4 that this is an HDMA document.  
 5 And I'd like to direct you to  
 6 page 2. I'm sorry, not page 2, page 1,  
 7 number 2. Just throwing you for a loop.  
 8 Do you see the row that  
 9 indicates "Petition DEA for a regulation to  
 10 clarify suspicious orders and/or suspicious  
 11 order monitoring expectations"?  
 12 Do you see where I am?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. And it says in the far  
 15 right column, "Favored this option above all  
 16 the others. Unlikely that DEA would create  
 17 such a regulation; therefore, low risk of  
 18 resulting in something overly restrictive or  
 19 difficult to follow. A good ask. The optics  
 20 would be positive. We go on the record as  
 21 asking for clarity. Recognize that this may  
 22 be -- this may tie into what is done on the  
 23 Hill or in a PR campaign, as external  
 24 pressure may be desirable and/or a legislator  
 25 may use it as the basis of a new bill. Some

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 961

1 document, and it's outside the scope  
 2 of the Touhy authorization.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat  
 4 that, please?  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 6 Q. Or that they recognized that it  
 7 was unlikely that DEA would create such a  
 8 regulation, so it was a low risk for  
 9 industry?  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: Same objections.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. When you were testifying -- and  
 14 you can put that away, Mr. Prevoznik.  
 15 When you were testifying  
 16 earlier in your deposition --  
 17 MR. BENNETT: If I might  
 18 interrupt for one second, I believe  
 19 there was -- in the record you asked  
 20 the question, and I think the witness  
 21 said "correct," and it was transcribed  
 22 as "no." But I just want the record  
 23 to be clear what your answer was to  
 24 her last question.  
 25 THE WITNESS: I believe it was

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 960

1 went so far as to state we should do this.  
 2 Urged HDMA to carefully articulate, one, what  
 3 we believe DEA should address; and two, DEA  
 4 should only inspect/enforce against what is  
 5 specified in the regulations."  
 6 Have I just read that  
 7 accurately, Mr. Prevoznik?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. And was DEA aware that the  
 10 reason HDMA was pressing for clarification of  
 11 suspicious order and suspicious order  
 12 monitoring expectations was for the optics of  
 13 it?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 15 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 16 MS. MAINIGI: And outside  
 17 scope.  
 18 THE WITNESS: No.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. Or that they recognized that it  
 21 was unlikely that DEA would actually create  
 22 such a regulation?  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 24 Foundation. Scope.  
 25 MS. MAINIGI: Misstates the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 962

1 "correct."  
 2 MS. SINGER: Thank you.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. All right. In your testimony  
 5 on day one or day two, you were asked whether  
 6 suspicious orders always lead to diversion.  
 7 Do you remember?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 10 form. Vague.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. Okay. And I think your answer  
 13 to that was, no, it doesn't always lead to  
 14 diversion.  
 15 Does that seem right to you?  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection. The  
 17 transcript speaks for itself.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. Okay. And is that because,  
 21 Mr. Prevoznik, not all suspicious orders turn  
 22 out to actually be suspicious?  
 23 A. Correct.  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 963

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Okay. But if a distributor  
 3 doesn't investigate a suspicious order, it  
 4 wouldn't know whether that order was being  
 5 diverted, right?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 7 form. Calls for speculation.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. And to use the language we  
 11 quoted earlier from the Diversion  
 12 Investigators Manual, sending out potentially  
 13 suspicious orders without investigating them  
 14 reflects a, quote, attitude of  
 15 irresponsibility.  
 16 Does DEA agree?  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 18 form. Outside the scope. Vague.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 21 P46 marked for identification.)  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. Let's turn to the Energy and  
 24 Commerce. Since we don't have previous --  
 25 the exhibits from last time, we're going to

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 965

1 says in that last paragraph, "As the opioid  
 2 epidemic began to surge, the DEA, by 2005,  
 3 realized that traditional policing of  
 4 individual doctors and pharmacies was no  
 5 longer an effective approach against the  
 6 oncoming avalanche of opioids from rogue  
 7 Internet pharmacies and pill mills. Instead,  
 8 DEA's focus turned to the drug wholesale  
 9 distributors, a choke point in the  
 10 pharmaceutical supply chain, who transfer  
 11 drugs from manufacturers to businesses such  
 12 as clinics, hospitals and pharmacies where  
 13 they can be dispensed to patients.  
 14 Distributors in previous years had not  
 15 received enforcement attention from the DEA.  
 16 The new focus looked for greater impact for  
 17 the highly consolidated industry given the  
 18 three -- given that the three major drug  
 19 distributors - AmerisourceBergen, Cardinal  
 20 Health and McKesson - control about  
 21 85 percent of the drug supply."  
 22 Do you agree with the statement  
 23 I've just read?  
 24 A. Yes.  
 25 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 964

1 remark the Energy and Commerce report as  
 2 Exhibit 46. It's the same report that went  
 3 in earlier in your testimony.  
 4 And industry lawyers asked  
 5 you -- they showed you a piece of the report  
 6 that said that DEA could have acted earlier.  
 7 Do you remember those  
 8 questions?  
 9 A. Vaguely, but, yes.  
 10 Q. Okay. And certainly this  
 11 Energy and Commerce report finds the DEA  
 12 could have done more than it did, correct?  
 13 A. Correct.  
 14 Q. Okay. But it's also highly  
 15 critical of distributors, is it not?  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 18 Foundation. Outside the scope.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Join the  
 20 scope objection.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. Okay. And just for context, I  
 24 want to direct you to page 5 of the report.  
 25 On the bottom of the page, it

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 966

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. And then "Beginning in 2005,  
 3 the DEA undertook a series of initiatives  
 4 meant to educate wholesale drug distributors  
 5 about their legal obligations to prevent  
 6 controlled substance diversion. The DEA's  
 7 distributor initiative included one-on-one  
 8 meetings with wholesale distributors in which  
 9 DEA officials provided specific examples  
 10 regarding distributors' own customers whose  
 11 ordering habits were suggestive of trends  
 12 indicating the presence of diversion and  
 13 illicit Internet pharmacies. Of the five  
 14 distributors investigated by the committee,  
 15 AmerisourceBergen, Cardinal, HD Smith and  
 16 McKesson, each had one-on-one meetings with  
 17 DEA as part of this initiative. In addition,  
 18 during 2006 and 2007, the DEA sent a series  
 19 of three letters, sent to all DEA-registered  
 20 distributors outlining their legal  
 21 obligations to conduct due diligence and  
 22 report suspicious orders."  
 23 Is that also an accurate  
 24 statement of what happened?  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 967

1 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. "Apparently the DEA soon  
 5 realized that the largest distributors were  
 6 not taking their compliance requirements with  
 7 sufficient seriousness. In 2007 and 2008,  
 8 the DEA took enforcement action through legal  
 9 settlements against the three largest  
 10 wholesale distributors in the US for alleged  
 11 violations of the CSA, with multi-million  
 12 dollar fines involving two of them."  
 13 Is that also accurate?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 16 form.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 19 Q. Last paragraph. "Despite these  
 20 settlement agreements and the subsequent  
 21 policy enhancements that the three  
 22 distributors made in their aftermath, the  
 23 committee found that the distributors  
 24 continued to ship large volumes of opioids  
 25 into West Virginia. The three largest

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 969

1 suffered a series of breakdowns or had a lack  
 2 of follow-through in their -- through in  
 3 their due diligence evaluations of  
 4 prospective pharmacy customers. As  
 5 demonstrated in the report, the committee  
 6 found instances of insufficient due diligence  
 7 by distributors who merely required  
 8 pharmacies to complete new customer  
 9 applications."  
 10 Now, we talked about that  
 11 earlier, correct?  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 13 form.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. And that is not sufficient to  
 17 comply with the registrant's obligation to  
 18 know their customers, correct?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 20 form. Foundation.  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Calls for a legal  
 22 conclusion.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. "There were cases where data

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 968

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 970

1 wholesale drug distributors in the United  
 2 States - AmerisourceBergen, Cardinal Health  
 3 and McKesson - sent more than 900 million  
 4 doses of hydrocodone and oxycodone to West  
 5 Virginia between 2005 and 2016. Cardinal  
 6 Health was the largest supplier of controlled  
 7 substances to West Virginia out of the five  
 8 companies examined as part of the Committee's  
 9 investigation, and distributed more than 366  
 10 million doses of hydrocodone and oxycodone to  
 11 West Virginia pharmacies between 2005 and  
 12 2016. From April 2006 through 2016, McKesson  
 13 supplied 299.87 million doses of hydrocodone  
 14 and oxycodone to West Virginia pharmacies,  
 15 AmerisourceBergen distributed 248.16 million  
 16 doses of hydrocodone and oxycodone to West  
 17 Virginia pharmacies between 2005 and 2016."  
 18 Is that also consistent with  
 19 DEA's understanding of what had occurred?  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 21 form. Foundation.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 24 Q. Turn the page, please. "Among  
 25 the Committee's findings, distributors

1 submitted by a new customer was not  
 2 critically analyzed to identify any red flags  
 3 of controlled substance diversion, for  
 4 example, potential red flags regarding a  
 5 pharmacy's prescribing physicians that raised  
 6 concerns about possible diversion were not  
 7 questioned."  
 8 Is that consistent with DEA's  
 9 understanding of what occurred?  
 10 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 11 Foundation.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. Goes on to say, "The  
 15 investigation found instances where there  
 16 were failures to monitor the volume of  
 17 controlled substances sold to customers.  
 18 Some distributors used thresholds to track  
 19 customers' purchases of controlled substances  
 20 and flag orders as suspicious when purchases  
 21 exceeded those limits. But some of these  
 22 thresholds were assigned arbitrarily and not  
 23 effective. Committee found instances in  
 24 which distributors set thresholds but failed  
 25 to enforce them, assigned artificially high

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 971

1 hydrocodone threshold limits with little to  
 2 no documented justification, or continued to  
 3 raise threshold levels without thoroughly  
 4 investigating or documenting the  
 5 justifications presented by a customer  
 6 pharmacy."  
 7 Again, is that what DEA  
 8 observed happened during this time period?  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 10 form. Foundation. Calls for  
 11 speculation.  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: Join.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. Okay. And is that failure to  
 16 flag suspicious orders, to approve them  
 17 without justification and to continue to  
 18 raise thresholds, a violation of the  
 19 Controlled Substances Act?  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Calls  
 21 for a legal conclusion. Outside the  
 22 scope.  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Objection to the  
 24 form.  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 973

1 distributor's employees relied on subjective  
 2 criteria to investigate [sic] orders it  
 3 considered suspicious."  
 4 Does that also reflect what the  
 5 DEA knew to happen during this time period?  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.  
 7 Foundation. Outside scope.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to the  
 9 form.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. And the last paragraph.  
 13 "Another critical failure identified by the  
 14 Committee involved instances in which  
 15 distributors appeared to turn a blind eye to  
 16 red flags of possible drug diversion.  
 17 Despite available information, distributors  
 18 at times took only minimal steps to  
 19 investigate possible warning signs of  
 20 diversion and continued to ship controlled  
 21 substances to suspect pharmacies. In several  
 22 cases, distributors either failed to fully  
 23 investigate potentially troubling information  
 24 they obtained from customer pharmacies or  
 25 willfully ignored it. These failures raise

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 972

1 form.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. It goes on, "Despite efforts by  
 5 DEA to educate distributors about their  
 6 responsibility to report suspicious orders,  
 7 the companies reviewed by the committee  
 8 failed to address suspicious orders" -- I'm  
 9 sorry -- "suspicious order monitoring in  
 10 critical ways. Rather than reporting  
 11 individual suspicious orders as they were  
 12 identified, some distributors reported a  
 13 variety of other types of information to DEA  
 14 over the years. This information included  
 15 excessive orders encompassing drug shipments  
 16 that had already been shipped and suspicious  
 17 customers such as pharmacies with which  
 18 distributors had terminated business  
 19 relationships. Neither of these types of  
 20 reports informed DEA about suspicious orders  
 21 in realtime, nor did they guarantee the  
 22 suspicious orders reported to DEA were also  
 23 blocked by the distributors. The committee  
 24 also found that one distributor lacked any  
 25 formal order monitoring program. Rather, the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 974

1 substantial concern given that DEA has said  
 2 existing knowledge of a geographic area's  
 3 problem with controlled substance abuse is a  
 4 factor that distributors should take into  
 5 account when evaluating customers."  
 6 Now, is that true, that DEA had  
 7 said knowledge of a geographic area's problem  
 8 with controlled substance abuse is a factor  
 9 that should be taken into account by  
 10 registrants?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 12 form.  
 13 MS. MAINIGI: Object to form.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. Okay. "West Virginia has the  
 17 highest drug overdose rate in the country,  
 18 meaning distributors should have been  
 19 particularly attuned to any red flags  
 20 encountered when conducting due diligence on  
 21 pharmacies in that state."  
 22 Is that also an accurate  
 23 reflection of a registrant's duty when  
 24 shipping controlled substances into West  
 25 Virginia or other hotspots?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 975

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 2 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the  
 4 scope.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. Okay. And this whole paragraph  
 8 that I just read, does that also reflect the  
 9 DEA's understanding of what happened during  
 10 this time period?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 12 form. Vague. Calls for a legal  
 13 conclusion.  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Join in the  
 15 form objection.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. Okay. Turn to page 10, please.  
 19 Bottom of page 10 there's a bullet that says,  
 20 "For due process reasons, it is current DEA  
 21 practice not to inform distributors or other  
 22 registrants about customers that may have  
 23 engaged in improper behavior."  
 24 Do you see where I am?  
 25 A. The bottom?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 977

1 form. Foundation. Calls for  
 2 speculation.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Outside scope.  
 4 MR. EPPICH: May be outside the  
 5 Touhy authorization as well.  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: That's what I  
 7 meant.  
 8 THE WITNESS: I mean, I don't  
 9 have the data in front of me to  
 10 confirm those numbers.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. Okay. What about the next  
 13 bullet: "McKesson did not submit suspicious  
 14 order reports to the DEA regarding orders  
 15 placed by West Virginia pharmacies until  
 16 August 1, 2013."  
 17 Do you know whether that's  
 18 accurate?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 20 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 21 Outside the Touhy authorization.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: This is  
 23 outside the Touhy authorization to the  
 24 extent that it calls for information  
 25 about West Virginia specifically.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 976

1 Q. Yes.  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. And does that accurately  
 4 reflect DEA's policy?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Hang on. We  
 7 had a different witness to testify  
 8 about this. You declined to ask her  
 9 questions. I'm going to instruct him  
 10 not to answer now.  
 11 MS. SINGER: Okay.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. So turning to page 16.  
 14 And I want to be respectful of  
 15 the scope of your authorization and not ask  
 16 you about individual investigations or  
 17 current matters. But to the extent you can  
 18 testify consistent with your authorization, I  
 19 want to point you to the third bullet:  
 20 "McKesson supplied just under 300 million  
 21 doses of hydrocodone and oxycodone to West  
 22 Virginia pharmacies between April 2006 and  
 23 2016."  
 24 Is that accurate?  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Object to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 978

1 MS. MAINIGI: The entire report  
 2 calls for information that relates to  
 3 West Virginia.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And our  
 5 authorization to the plaintiffs was --  
 6 concluded investigations and  
 7 settlements with the defendants, but  
 8 we specifically didn't authorize  
 9 region-specific investigations.  
 10 MS. SINGER: Okay. We will  
 11 skip this then.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. Okay. Let's turn to page 319.  
 14 You with me? You at page 319?  
 15 A. Uh-huh.  
 16 Q. Okay. Turning towards the  
 17 middle of the page, just below it, the second  
 18 paragraph from the bottom. "But as  
 19 demonstrated by the Committee's  
 20 investigation, the DEA did not always receive  
 21 the level of compliance required under the  
 22 CSA. The five distributors whose actions in  
 23 West Virginia were examined by the Committee  
 24 each had unique failures. The companies had  
 25 various policies and procedures in place to

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 979

1 prevent diversion but in some cases did not  
 2 adequately follow or carry out those  
 3 policies. As evidenced in the case studies  
 4 discussed in each section, distributors had  
 5 failings on multiple fronts."  
 6 Is that consistent with the  
 7 DEA's conclusions?  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 9 form. Foundation. Calls for  
 10 speculation. Outside the Touhy  
 11 authorization.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. "For instance, it is not  
 15 sufficient due diligence for a distributor to  
 16 only require prospective or existing  
 17 customers to complete pharmacy questionnaires  
 18 or supply supplemental data. The information  
 19 disclosed on such questionnaires or the data  
 20 submitted must also be critically analyzed to  
 21 identify any red flags of controlled  
 22 substance diversion."  
 23 Does that accurately reflect a  
 24 distributor's obligations or a registrant's  
 25 obligations?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 981

1 MS. MAINIGI: Vague as to time.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. All right. We can leave this  
 5 report.  
 6 Okay. In questioning during  
 7 the first two days of your deposition,  
 8 Mr. Prevoznik, do you remember discussing the  
 9 fact that a small percentage of doctors are  
 10 engaged in unlawful prescribing?  
 11 I think it was .5 percent.  
 12 Do you remember that  
 13 conversation?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 16 P47 marked for identification.)  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. Okay. So I want to turn to  
 19 Exhibit 47, please.  
 20 And that is Bates number  
 21 PPLP0300001799742.  
 22 If you turn to the first slide,  
 23 it's titled "DEA/OD 11th Pharmaceutical  
 24 Industry Conference."  
 25 Do you recognize this

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 980

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 982

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 2 form.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. "Once distributors bring  
 6 pharmacies on board, they need to monitor the  
 7 volume of controlled substances sold to  
 8 customers."  
 9 Does that also accurately  
 10 reflect a registrant's duties?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 12 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. And the last sentence,  
 16 "Subsequently, when distributors set  
 17 thresholds for customers, they should be  
 18 enforced. In such cases where thresholds are  
 19 adjusted, distributors should be able to  
 20 document the justification for these  
 21 changes."  
 22 Does that also accurately  
 23 reflect a registrant's obligations?  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 25 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.

1 presentation?  
 2 A. Do we know what year?  
 3 Q. And what is it?  
 4 A. No, I said, "Do we know what  
 5 year?"  
 6 Q. Oh. So it's Tuesday,  
 7 September 16th. And if you look at the  
 8 calendar in the years that are referenced, we  
 9 believe it to be 2003 because of when  
 10 Tuesday -- when September 16th is a Tuesday.  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 12 THE WITNESS: I've never seen  
 13 this before.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. Okay. It does have on the  
 16 front page DOJ, DEA logos, correct?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Okay. And does it look -- from  
 19 your knowledge, is this a presentation by the  
 20 DEA?  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 22 Foundation. Form.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. Okay. And if you turn to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 983

1 fifth page, with the slide "retail  
 2 diversion," 90 percent at doctor, pharmacy,  
 3 hospital levels.  
 4 Do you see that slide?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. Okay. And if you look at the  
 7 notes that are at the bottom of that slide,  
 8 do you see the bottom section that starts,  
 9 "Estimated 1.5 percent of doctors are  
 10 negligent and/or dishonest"?  
 11 Do you see where I'm reading?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. Okay. It says, "That portion  
 14 of DEA-registered physicians is many  
 15 thousands. Their CS, or controlled  
 16 substance, prescribing would total hundreds  
 17 of thousands of scripts/millions of dosage  
 18 units into illicit market."  
 19 Is that accurate?  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 21 Foundation. Form. Misstates the  
 22 document. Calls for speculation.  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to the  
 24 scope.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 985

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Or an important tool for the  
 3 DEA?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Object to form and  
 5 foundation.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. Okay. And in fact, that's part  
 9 of the foundation of the Controlled  
 10 Substances Act, that each participant in the  
 11 supply chain has to police its own  
 12 participation in that supply chain, correct?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 14 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 15 Misstates.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. All right. And during the  
 19 questioning by some of the industry counsel  
 20 during the first two days of depositions, do  
 21 you remember the suggestion that prescribers  
 22 were better situated to identify improper  
 23 prescriptions?  
 24 Do you remember that testimony?  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 984

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. And is it true, as it says  
 3 here, that it is impossible for DEA to  
 4 investigate and discipline that number of  
 5 professionals?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 7 Foundation.  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: Scope.  
 9 THE WITNESS: I mean, we do the  
 10 best we can.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. But that's a lot of --  
 13 A. It's a lot.  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 15 form.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. And the last line here, "Far  
 18 more effective, address the risk at the apex  
 19 of the distribution center [sic]."  
 20 Is that accurate, that that is  
 21 a more effective way of enforcing compliance  
 22 with the Controlled Substances Act?  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 24 Foundation.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 986

1 to the extent it misstates prior  
 2 testimony.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Not really.  
 4 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 5 P48 marked for identification.)  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. Okay. Is it -- let's just turn  
 8 to the document.  
 9 All right. I'm showing you  
 10 Exhibit 48. And the level -- and I'm sorry,  
 11 this is CAH\_MDL2804\_00889528.  
 12 Do you recognize the logo on  
 13 the front of this presentation?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. And what is it?  
 16 A. It's our Chief Counsel's logo.  
 17 Q. Okay. And if you turn to the  
 18 inside first page, How to Keep Or Lose Your  
 19 DEA Registration, do you recognize this  
 20 presentation?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. And what do you recognize it to  
 23 be?  
 24 A. It was one of the -- it was --  
 25 it was given at a conference that we held.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 987

1 Q. A conference --  
 2 A. For the industry.  
 3 Q. Okay. A conference that DEA  
 4 had for industry?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. And do you know who gave this  
 7 presentation?  
 8 Do you know if would have been  
 9 Linden Barber?  
 10 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 11 Calls for speculation.  
 12 THE WITNESS: I believe it was  
 13 Linden that gave this.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. Okay. And Linden Barber was  
 16 with the Chief Counsel's Office of DEA,  
 17 correct?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. Okay. And if you turn to  
 20 page 4 of the presentation, titled "Effective  
 21 Controls Against Diversion," the first point  
 22 there is what, the first bullet point?  
 23 A. "Good recordkeeping is  
 24 essential."  
 25 Q. Do you agree with that

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 989

1 registrant's responsibility to act on  
 2 information that points to diversion,  
 3 correct?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 5 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. And it's not that the  
 9 registrant is being asked to judge a  
 10 prescription or a patient, but to look at red  
 11 flags like the volume or dose or appearance  
 12 of a practice, et cetera, correct?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 14 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 15 Vague.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Yes, they should  
 17 look into totality of everything  
 18 that's presented to them.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. Okay. And the last excuse on  
 21 this slide, "I'm not responsible for what my  
 22 customer does with the drugs."  
 23 Is that an excuse that the DEA  
 24 accepts from a registrant?  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 988

1 statement?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. In DEA's experience, is the  
 4 absence of documentation a fairly good  
 5 indication that something didn't happen in a  
 6 registrant's compliance program?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 8 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. Okay. Turning to page 9, this  
 12 is what doesn't work, or how to lose your DEA  
 13 registration.  
 14 The second bullet point, what  
 15 does that say?  
 16 A. "It is not my job to  
 17 second-guess the doctor."  
 18 Q. Okay. And that's not an excuse  
 19 that the DEA will accept from a registrant,  
 20 correct?  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 22 Vague.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. And that's because it's a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 990

1 Vague.  
 2 THE WITNESS: No.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. And that's because a registrant  
 5 is responsible to make sure that they are not  
 6 supplying to potential diversion, correct?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 8 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 9 Vague.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. And do you know what Linden  
 13 Barber does now, by the way?  
 14 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 15 Outside the scope.  
 16 THE WITNESS: I believe -- I  
 17 believe he's still with Cardinal.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 19 Q. Now, you were asked by --  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let's take  
 21 our last break before lunch.  
 22 MS. SINGER: Okay.  
 23 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off  
 24 record. The time is 11:36.  
 25 (Off the record at 11:36 a.m.)

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 991

1 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back  
 2 on the record. Beginning of Media  
 3 File 4. The time is 11:48.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. So, Mr. Prevoznik, just turning  
 6 back for a minute to the Linden Barber  
 7 presentation we were talking about before the  
 8 break, which is Bates number 889528, I want  
 9 to ask you to turn to page 13, please.  
 10 And it's a slide titled "How to  
 11 Keep Your DEA Registration."  
 12 Do you see that?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. And it says in the --  
 15 under the first master bullet, "Master the  
 16 obvious: Recordkeeping, reporting," and the  
 17 last item, "Does it quack like a diverting  
 18 duck."  
 19 Is what Mr. Barber is saying  
 20 here, what the DEA is saying, is if it looks  
 21 like a suspicious order, it's a suspicious  
 22 order?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. And that if it has the signs,  
 25 quacks like a duck, walks like a duck,

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 993

1 P49 marked for identification.)  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. Okay. And then I want to turn  
 4 you to what we'll mark as Bates -- as  
 5 Exhibit 49.  
 6 And this is  
 7 Anda\_Opioids\_MDL\_0000476052. It's "What You  
 8 Know and Who You Know," a presentation by  
 9 Linden Barber.  
 10 Do you see where I'm reading  
 11 from?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. And it's dated April 19, 2012,  
 14 correct?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Okay. And at this point Linden  
 17 Barber is no longer with the DEA, correct?  
 18 A. Correct.  
 19 Q. Okay. And it seems that he's  
 20 with Cegedim.  
 21 We heard that name before,  
 22 correct?  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 24 Foundation. Outside the scope of the  
 25 Touhy authorization.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 992

1 whatever that expression is, that it's a  
 2 duck; it's a suspicious order, correct?  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. No  
 4 foundation. Outside the scope of the  
 5 Touhy authorization.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. Okay. And then it goes on to  
 9 say, "Know your customers and, where  
 10 applicable, the prescriber's business or  
 11 professional practice."  
 12 Is that also the DEA's guidance  
 13 to industry as to what's required?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. And "know the statutory  
 16 factors, the DEA's final orders," and then  
 17 lastly, "act consistently with DEA's goal:  
 18 protect the public health and safety from the  
 19 harms caused by diversion."  
 20 Is that also the guidance that  
 21 DEA gave to industry about complying with the  
 22 Controlled Substances Act?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.  
 25 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 994

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 2 You can answer, if you know.  
 3 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. Okay. I'd like to direct you  
 6 to page 10 of the presentation, Bates  
 7 number 6061.  
 8 And I'm sorry, before you go  
 9 there, on the title page of the presentation  
 10 it indicates Linden Barber is the director of  
 11 DEA compliance operations at Quarles & Brady?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. Okay. All right. So turning  
 14 to slide 10, Bates number 6061, it says,  
 15 "Know Your Regulator."  
 16 Do you see where I'm reading?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. "Access to customer due  
 19 diligence files." And it says under the  
 20 second bullet, "What is a customer's due  
 21 diligence file? Not a record required by law  
 22 to be made or kept. Proof that a  
 23 distributor -- the distributor is attempting  
 24 to prevent diversion. Proof that the  
 25 distributor heeded DEA's warning. Exhibit A

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 995

1 in DEA's case against you."

2 Do you understand what

3 Mr. Barber is saying here?

4 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.

5 Foundation. Outside the scope of the

6 Touhy authorization.

7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for

8 speculation. I agree with the scope

9 objection.

10 MS. SINGER: Okay. Let me --

11 I'm sorry. Let me rephrase it.

12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

13 Q. Is it the DEA's position that a

14 customer due diligence file is not required

15 to be made or kept?

16 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Asked

17 and answered. Objection. Form.

18 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

19 Q. It's certainly not -- when

20 Mr. Barber was with DEA in that presentation

21 we just looked at, he encouraged

22 recordkeeping, correct, as a way a registrant

23 could keep their DEA license, correct?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. Okay. And here he's saying not

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 997

1 All right. We can leave this

2 document.

3 Now, you were asked during

4 day one or two of your deposition how a

5 manufacturer would know if a prescriber was

6 suspicious.

7 Do you remember those

8 questions?

9 A. Yes.

10 MR. EPPICH: Object to the

11 form.

12 THE WITNESS: Yes.

13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

14 Q. Would DEA agree that a

15 significant increase in a prescriber's volume

16 is a sign of potential diversion?

17 MR. EPPICH: Object to the

18 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.

19 THE WITNESS: Just volume

20 alone?

21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

22 Q. That it is one sign of

23 potential diversion, yes.

24 A. It --

25 MR. EPPICH: Object to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 996

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 998

1 a record required by law to be made or kept,

2 correct?

3 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to

4 form. Objection. Outside the scope

5 of the Touhy authorization. Calls for

6 a legal conclusion.

7 THE WITNESS: What he's saying

8 is that -- I'm speculating on this,

9 but what he's saying, to me, is that

10 the actual terms "due diligence" is

11 not in the regulations; however, I

12 mean, the statute's to prevent -- to

13 have effective means to guard against

14 diversion, you would have to know who

15 your customer is.

16 And so doing that, you would

17 have -- I mean, dealing with as many

18 customers that each of these

19 distributors have, you would have to

20 know who your customers are. So if

21 you don't have files on them, it would

22 be very hard to maintain effective

23 controls.

24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

25 Q. Right. Understood.

1 form.

2 THE WITNESS: Potentially, yes.

3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

4 Q. Okay. And that a prescriber

5 who is prescribing at very high volume

6 relative to other practitioners, that would

7 also be another potential red flag of

8 diversion, correct?

9 MR. EPPICH: Object to the

10 form. Form. Vague. Improper

11 hypothetical. Calls for a legal

12 conclusion.

13 THE WITNESS: It could be. It

14 just depends on what is the

15 physician's practice; does he

16 specialize in end of life or something

17 like that. I mean, you'd have to take

18 in other factors.

19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:

20 Q. Right. You have to look at the

21 whole picture.

22 But that's one sign that might

23 alert you to take a closer look, correct?

24 A. Correct.

25 MR. EPPICH: Object to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 999

1 form.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. Okay. And if the prescriber is  
 4 prescribing at very high doses, again, one  
 5 factor, depending on their specialty and  
 6 patients, that might alert a registrant to  
 7 potential diversion, correct?  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 9 form. Foundation. Calls for  
 10 speculation. Calls for a legal  
 11 conclusion.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. Okay. And these are the kinds  
 15 of commonsense red flags that a registrant  
 16 should know to apply without the DEA telling  
 17 them to apply them, correct?  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 19 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to the  
 21 form.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat  
 23 it, please?  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. These are the kinds of

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1001

1 this information from, what is this  
 2 document? Where was it created? Was  
 3 it created by the plaintiffs?  
 4 MS. MAINIGI: It says an expert  
 5 report of Lacey Keller.  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Additionally,  
 7 information concerning this doctor may  
 8 be subject to various law enforcement  
 9 privileges, and it's outside the  
 10 scope.  
 11 But I'm going to specifically  
 12 instruct you not to testify about  
 13 ongoing investigations.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. So would writing 21,000  
 16 prescriptions in a year when the average  
 17 doctor in the same specialty wrote 500 be a  
 18 red flag of potential diversion to the DEA?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 20 MR. MAHADY: Objection to form.  
 21 Objection to scope. Incomplete  
 22 hypothetical. Foundation.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. Okay. And then turning to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1000

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1002

1 commonsense red flags that a registrant  
 2 should know to apply in looking for diversion  
 3 without the DEA telling them specifically to  
 4 look for them, correct?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 8 P50 marked for identification.)  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. I'm showing you Exhibit 50,  
 11 Mr. Prevoznik. These are two -- oh, I'm  
 12 sorry, this is a prescriber in Solon, Ohio.  
 13 I'm sorry. I'm not -- okay.  
 14 Dr. Akhtar-Zaidi in Solon, Ohio.  
 15 And it says here, "Wrote over  
 16 21,000 opioid prescriptions in 2011 when the  
 17 average doctor in his specialty wrote 500."  
 18 Would the DEA consider that to  
 19 be a red flag of potential diversion?  
 20 MR. MAHADY: Object to form.  
 21 Objection. Foundation. Objection to  
 22 the scope. Outside the Touhy  
 23 authorization.  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Hang on.  
 25 MR. MAHADY: And also, where is

1 next page of that slide. I'm sorry --  
 2 A. I don't have it.  
 3 Q. Okay. Sorry.  
 4 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibits  
 5 P51 and P52 marked for  
 6 identification.)  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. Showing you slide 51,  
 9 Dr. Adolph Harper in Akron, Ohio.  
 10 I'm also going to show you the  
 11 sentencing memo. We'll mark that as  
 12 Exhibit 52.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: So while  
 14 we're shuffling paper, I can get my  
 15 concerns and objection on the record.  
 16 My understanding is that the  
 17 task force officers have been  
 18 authorized to give testimony about  
 19 this doctor and this information. I  
 20 can tell you this witness has not been  
 21 prepped to.  
 22 And so I'm going to instruct  
 23 you not to answer questions about this  
 24 specific doctor.  
 25 And I think you have a witness

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1003

1 who will.  
 2 MS. SINGER: All right. I'm  
 3 only asking about whether these are  
 4 red flags generally.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You can  
 6 answer about general red flags.  
 7 MS. SINGER: Okay.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. So if you turn on exhibit --  
 10 which exhibit is this? 53? 52?  
 11 Okay. The sentencing memo --  
 12 MR. COOPER: Do you have an  
 13 extra copy of the sentencing memo?  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. Which is PLTF\_2804\_000013676.  
 16 It's the government's sentencing memo,  
 17 memorandum in United States of America versus  
 18 Adolph Harper.  
 19 You on the right document?  
 20 A. Uh-huh, yes.  
 21 Q. Okay. And if you turn to  
 22 page 4, in the second paragraph, the first  
 23 full paragraph of the page, it says, "The  
 24 atmosphere of Harper's office, like his  
 25 prescribing practices, was more akin to a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1005

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Yes.  
 3 Would those signs observed by a  
 4 registrant about a prescriber's practice have  
 5 been red flags of potential diversion?  
 6 MR. MAHADY: Same objections.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. Are these kinds of red flags  
 10 that we just went through with these two  
 11 prescribers things that registrants who are  
 12 observing the practices or seeing this data  
 13 should have been able to figure out for  
 14 themselves, should have been able to identify  
 15 them as red flags?  
 16 MR. MAHADY: Objection to form.  
 17 Foundation. Same objection regarding  
 18 the scope.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 21 Q. Did a manufacturer who observed  
 22 a doctor's office that looked like a drug  
 23 trafficking operation, with patients passed  
 24 out or vomiting in the office or urinating on  
 25 themselves, have a duty to do more than just

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1004

1 street-level drug trafficking operation  
 2 rather than medical office. Harper's  
 3 customers waited for hours to see Harper.  
 4 Many of those customers exhibited behaviors  
 5 consistent with drug abuse. Witnesses  
 6 reported seeing customers passed out in the  
 7 hallway and office while waiting to see  
 8 Harper, were vomiting or urinating on the  
 9 floor while waiting in the waiting room.  
 10 Customers were also combative and aggressive  
 11 with Harper's staff members if there was any  
 12 delay in receiving their drugs."  
 13 Would a registrant observing  
 14 this medical office have seen a red flag of  
 15 potential diversion?  
 16 MR. MAHADY: Objection to form.  
 17 Objection to foundation. Outside the  
 18 scope of the Touhy authorization as  
 19 the government just explained it.  
 20 Question specifically relates  
 21 to a doctor whose name was used at  
 22 least four or five times in forming  
 23 your question.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat  
 25 it?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1006

1 stopping to market to that doctor but also to  
 2 report that doctor to the DEA?  
 3 MR. COOPER: Objection. Form.  
 4 Foundation. Scope.  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 6 Foundation. Incomplete hypothetical.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat  
 8 it?  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. Did a manufacturer who observed  
 11 that kind of practice that we just described  
 12 have an obligation to report that doctor to  
 13 the DEA or other law enforcement or just to  
 14 stop marketing to that doctor? Would that  
 15 have been enough?  
 16 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 17 Form. Foundation. Scope.  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 19 Incomplete hypothetical.  
 20 THE WITNESS: So I just want to  
 21 make sure I'm clear on the question.  
 22 If the manufacturer had seen  
 23 this?  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. That's correct.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1007

1 A. Right.  
 2 They should stop shipments?  
 3 Q. Is it enough to stop marketing  
 4 to the doctor, or do they also have to report  
 5 that doctor as part of maintaining effective  
 6 controls to prevent diversion?  
 7 MR. O'CONNOR: Same objections.  
 8 THE WITNESS: I mean, they  
 9 should be telling us that.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. Now, does the fact that there  
 12 are bad doctors who are writing illegitimate  
 13 prescriptions or pharmacies that are  
 14 dispensing illegally relieve distributors or  
 15 manufacturers of their duty to review their  
 16 own information and data for suspicious  
 17 orders and signs of diversion?  
 18 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 19 Vague. Objection. Outside the scope  
 20 of the Touhy authorization.  
 21 Objection. Foundation.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'll object  
 23 to the form.  
 24 THE WITNESS: No.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1009

1 inappropriate to be marking this in a  
 2 deposition.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. Do registrants who close their  
 5 eyes, fail to report signs of suspicious  
 6 order, comply with the Controlled Substances  
 7 Act?  
 8 MR. MAHADY: Objection. Form.  
 9 Foundation. Calls for a legal  
 10 conclusion.  
 11 THE WITNESS: No, they don't.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. We can take down the monkeys.  
 14 They're probably not compliant with the CSA  
 15 either.  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. You testified before that the  
 19 DEA doesn't know what range of information  
 20 registrants have available to them, correct?  
 21 A. Correct.  
 22 Q. And they don't have to share  
 23 with the DEA all the data and information  
 24 they have on their customers, correct?  
 25 A. Correct.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1008

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1010

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. And in fact, in a closed  
 3 system, the participants in the supply chain,  
 4 those who are on the inside, have a duty to  
 5 look out for bad doctors and bad pharmacies,  
 6 correct?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 8 form. Foundation. Calls for a legal  
 9 conclusion.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 11 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 12 P53 marked for identification.)  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. Okay. Let's go to the -- I'm  
 15 going to show you Exhibit 53. No Bates  
 16 number, just monkeys.  
 17 Do you recognize this image of  
 18 the see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil,  
 19 Mr. Prevoznik?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 MR. MAHADY: Objection. Form.  
 22 Foundation. Relevance to anything.  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: It's completely  
 24 outside the scope of the Touhy  
 25 authorization. I think it's highly

1 Q. Now, you talked about the fact  
 2 that DEA doesn't set a formula or a threshold  
 3 for industry to apply, correct?  
 4 A. Correct.  
 5 Q. And is that -- is the reason  
 6 for that because the DEA wouldn't necessarily  
 7 be able to capture what the industry knows  
 8 about its own customers in setting a  
 9 threshold?  
 10 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 11 form. Vague.  
 12 THE WITNESS: I think it's  
 13 part -- a part of -- certainly that's  
 14 part of it, but the other part would  
 15 also be we don't regulate the practice  
 16 of medicine, so we're not interfering  
 17 with what doctors are doing to treat  
 18 their patients.  
 19 So in discussions with -- when  
 20 these thresholds and things -- it also  
 21 affects the opposite side. So it's  
 22 not only the diverted side, but it's  
 23 also legitimate patients who can't get  
 24 them because of these thresholds that  
 25 are in place. So it's affecting both

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1011

1 sides of the -- it's a delicate  
 2 balance.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. And so you leave that to a  
 5 registrant who has all of that information,  
 6 correct?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 8 Foundation. Form.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. Okay. And the danger is if the  
 12 DEA were to set the threshold too high, it  
 13 wouldn't be a real check on identifying  
 14 suspicious orders, correct?  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 16 form. Incomplete hypothetical.  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Speculation.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. And if you set it too low, as  
 21 you said, patients might not be able to get  
 22 medicine they need, correct?  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 24 form. Incomplete hypothetical. Calls  
 25 for speculation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1013

1 Q. Okay. And it says -- if you  
 2 look down this document, you see  
 3 Mr. Crawford, I think, three paragraphs from  
 4 the bottom. Okay. I'm sorry, let's go up  
 5 from that to the question.  
 6 "During the distributor  
 7 breakout session, suspicious order monitoring  
 8 was certainly a hotbed of discussion. Are  
 9 there any plans for DEA to publicize  
 10 information to implement SOM, or suspicious  
 11 order monitoring, incorporate algorithms  
 12 where products are more likely to be  
 13 diverted?"  
 14 Do you see where I'm reading?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Okay. And then can you read  
 17 Mr. Crawford's response?  
 18 A. "Whatever we put out will be  
 19 outdated by the time we put it out. You're  
 20 looking at a number. Tell me how much --  
 21 tell me how much that we can't exceed. DEA  
 22 can't do that. It's part of your due  
 23 diligence, knowing your customer."  
 24 Q. And does that reflect what you  
 25 just testified to in the guidance that DEA

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1012

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. And so it's not that the DEA  
 4 has some answer on what the threshold should  
 5 be and isn't telling industry; it's that the  
 6 DEA is actually saying that industry knows  
 7 better from its own customers, correct?  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 9 form. Calls for speculation.  
 10 THE WITNESS: They're in a  
 11 better position than we are.  
 12 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 13 P54 marked for identification.)  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. Okay. So let's go to -- I'm  
 16 showing you Exhibit 54.  
 17 So do you recognize  
 18 MNK-T1\_0008504654?  
 19 A. I recognize the names.  
 20 Q. Okay. Which names do you  
 21 recognize?  
 22 A. Mark Caverly and James  
 23 Crawford.  
 24 Q. And who are they?  
 25 A. Former employees of DEA.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1014

1 gave industry?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 MR. MAHADY: Objection. Form.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 6 Q. And then can you read  
 7 Mr. Caverly's comment at the bottom of the  
 8 page?  
 9 A. From the question "What does  
 10 the DEA expect?"  
 11 Q. That's right.  
 12 A. "Previously, DEA sat down with  
 13 the National Drug Association with an  
 14 algorithm DEA standpoint - you know your  
 15 customers better than we do. DEA stepped  
 16 away from providing guidelines. It's not  
 17 going to happen."  
 18 Q. Does that also reflect DEA's  
 19 view as to why it wouldn't provide a  
 20 threshold to industry?  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 22 form. Foundation. Calls for  
 23 speculation.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 25 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1015

1 P55 marked for identification.)  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. Okay. Showing you Exhibit 55.  
 4 My goal here is to make your pile go up and  
 5 mine go down.  
 6 All right. This is  
 7 MCKMDL00561303, executive summary regarding  
 8 the HDMA document.  
 9 Have you seen this document  
 10 before, Mr. Prevoznik?  
 11 A. I'm not sure.  
 12 Q. Okay. Let me direct you to the  
 13 last page, Bates number 306. It says in that  
 14 top bullet to question 10, "This is another  
 15 area that we have made great strides in over  
 16 the past few years. Our analytical  
 17 capabilities provide us with greater insight  
 18 into our own customer base. We have this  
 19 data already and frankly are in a position to  
 20 provide better information to DEA than they  
 21 could provide to us."  
 22 Does DEA agree with that  
 23 statement?  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 25 form. Foundation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1017

1 Q. Okay. Based on your experience  
 2 in all of your years at DEA in management and  
 3 as a diversion investigator and as the  
 4 representative of the DEA here today, did DEA  
 5 make the best judgments it could at the time  
 6 to use your authority and resources most  
 7 effectively to prevent diversion?  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 9 Vague.  
 10 MS. MAINIGI: And objection.  
 11 Outside the scope of the Touhy  
 12 authorization.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes, I think we  
 14 did.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. Had distributors reported  
 17 suspicious orders to the DEA as the law  
 18 required would DEA have been able to use its  
 19 resources more effectively to identify and  
 20 prevent diversion?  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 22 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 23 Vague.  
 24 MS. MAINIGI: And outside the  
 25 scope of the Touhy authorization.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1016

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. And it says as a sidenote, "DEA  
 4 does not have dispensing data, nor do they  
 5 have noncontrol data," correct?  
 6 A. Correct.  
 7 Q. Okay. All right. Let's move  
 8 to -- no, new area.  
 9 In the first two days of your  
 10 deposition, you were offered -- you were  
 11 asked a series of questions about things DEA  
 12 could have done differently: Did you set up  
 13 task forces or use ARCOS platforms in a  
 14 different way.  
 15 Do you remember that line of  
 16 questioning?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Now, when you came into DEA,  
 19 what was your first position?  
 20 A. Diversion investigator in the  
 21 Philadelphia field office.  
 22 Q. Okay. So you were out there  
 23 doing investigations and inspections and  
 24 building cases, correct?  
 25 A. Correct.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1018

1 MS. DO AMARAL: Incomplete  
 2 hypothetical.  
 3 THE WITNESS: I believe so.  
 4 MR. EPPICH: I second the  
 5 outside the scope of the Touhy  
 6 authorization.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. Could you state your answer  
 9 again?  
 10 A. I believe so.  
 11 Q. Okay. And if registrants had  
 12 reported suspicious orders to the DEA, does  
 13 the DEA believe that there would have been  
 14 less diversion, less abuse and less death?  
 15 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 16 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 17 Incomplete hypothetical. Outside the  
 18 scope of the Touhy authorization.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 20 for speculation.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. Would you agree that this line  
 24 of questions about what the DEA could have  
 25 done or should have done sounds a lot like

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1019

1 blaming the DEA for not catching industry at  
 2 breaking the law?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 4 form. Foundation. Incomplete  
 5 hypothetical. Outside the scope of  
 6 the Touhy authorization.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 8 for speculation.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 10 repeat it?  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. Would you agree that this line  
 13 of questions about what the DEA could have  
 14 done and should have done sounds a lot like  
 15 blaming the DEA for not catching the industry  
 16 in breaking the law?  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 19 objections.  
 20 THE WITNESS: You're asking me  
 21 personally?  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. Yes.  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Me, personally,

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1021

1 12-year-old or anyplace else they shouldn't  
 2 be?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 4 form. Incomplete hypothetical. Calls  
 5 for a legal conclusion. Scope.  
 6 Vague.  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'll object  
 8 to the form.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. And do you think there's  
 12 anything about that rule that isn't clear or  
 13 fair to registrants?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 15 form. Vague. Incomplete  
 16 hypothetical. Scope. Calls for a  
 17 legal conclusion.  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm going to  
 19 object that that's outside the scope  
 20 of the Touhy authorization.  
 21 You can answer in your personal  
 22 capacity.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 24 repeat it?  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1020

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1022

1 it certainly would have made a huge  
 2 difference.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. Does the obligation to maintain  
 5 effective controls to prevent diversion exist  
 6 whether or not you are caught?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Objection to the  
 8 form. Incomplete hypothetical. Calls  
 9 for a legal conclusion. Outside the  
 10 scope of the Touhy authorization as it  
 11 may divulge the deliberative process  
 12 of the DEA.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I appreciate  
 14 your concern about our deliberative  
 15 process.  
 16 You can answer.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 19 Q. And is it true that the cost of  
 20 doing a business, of getting a license that  
 21 allows you to make money by making and  
 22 selling and distributing narcotics, is that  
 23 you have to do your best to follow the law  
 24 and prevent those narcotics from ending up  
 25 on -- in the street or in the pockets of a

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. I have to scroll back through a  
 3 lot of objections.  
 4 Is there anything about that  
 5 rule, to follow the law to prevent diversion,  
 6 that isn't clear or fair to registrants?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 8 THE WITNESS: My personal  
 9 perspective, no, there isn't.  
 10 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 11 P56 marked for identification.)  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. I'm going to show you  
 14 Exhibit 56.  
 15 Mr. Prevoznik, this is our  
 16 effort to put in a timeline the actions DEA  
 17 took against defendants in this litigation.  
 18 Does this capture the major  
 19 enforcement initiatives that DEA took against  
 20 distributors, manufacturers and distributors,  
 21 including pharmacies?  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 23 form. Objection. Foundation.  
 24 Objection to inaccuracy of the data  
 25 that may or may not be in the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1023

1 document.  
 2 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the scope  
 3 of the Touhy authorization.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Yeah, I'm  
 5 going to repeat my concern about the  
 6 scope. You've been authorized to  
 7 testify about administrative actions  
 8 in closed settlements with the  
 9 defendants.  
 10 MS. SINGER: That's what's  
 11 here.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: If you're  
 13 representing that, then subject to  
 14 that instruction, you can answer.  
 15 MR. MAHADY: I'm also going to  
 16 object to the extent that the  
 17 demonstrative clearly shows things  
 18 that are not an enforcement action,  
 19 including references to letters --  
 20 MS. MAINIGI: Right.  
 21 MR. MAHADY: -- that are not  
 22 from the DEA, DOJ and, in fact, come  
 23 from the defendant.  
 24 MS. MAINIGI: That is not what  
 25 it is represented by plaintiffs to be.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1025

1 to do those questions.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. I'm just asking if this  
 4 represents the scale and number of  
 5 enforcement actions that DEA took against the  
 6 defendants in this litigation.  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form  
 8 and foundation.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. To the extent you know.  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And my  
 12 instruction to you is you're  
 13 authorized to answer based on  
 14 administrative actions and/or  
 15 settlements that the DEA has entered  
 16 into with any of the defendants, but  
 17 limit your answer to that.  
 18 MR. RUIZ: And objection to the  
 19 extent that this chart has enforcement  
 20 actions against entities who are not  
 21 named defendants in this action.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Do you  
 23 understand my instruction?  
 24 THE WITNESS: Yeah.  
 25 It appears to have most of the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1024

1 MR. RUIZ: Also object in it  
 2 lists the alleged enforcement actions  
 3 and do not relate to distribution.  
 4 MR. MAHADY: And enforcement  
 5 actions by the state courts.  
 6 MS. SINGER: So these are all  
 7 facts that have been established or  
 8 will be established in the course of  
 9 this litigation.  
 10 To the extent that defendants  
 11 have an argument that something here  
 12 wasn't tied together, that's an  
 13 argument they can make as to  
 14 admissibility.  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: You're asking  
 16 this corporate representative to  
 17 somehow bless your document when  
 18 you've just created it and provided it  
 19 to him.  
 20 If you want to go point by  
 21 point through this document and ask  
 22 him if he knows about those and  
 23 whether they're enforcement actions,  
 24 go ahead.  
 25 MS. SINGER: So you're welcome

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1026

1 highlights.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. Okay. And is it fair to say  
 4 that the DEA has investigated or taken action  
 5 against virtually every major distributor of  
 6 opioids over the last 15 years?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form and  
 8 foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 MS. FUMERTON: Also vague.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. And also the major pharmacy  
 13 chains that distribute opioids?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. And also manufacturers like  
 18 Mallinckrodt and Purdue, correct?  
 19 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. Now, this chart doesn't reflect  
 23 additional actions that the DEA took against  
 24 doctors and pharmacists, correct?  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Objection.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1027

1 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 2 Form.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. Or actions you took against  
 6 independent pharmacies.  
 7 And I take it the DEA also took  
 8 enforcement action against non-chain  
 9 pharmacies, correct?  
 10 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 11 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 12 Form.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. I  
 14 don't want to ask questions.  
 15 You can answer in your personal  
 16 capacity.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Yes. In my  
 18 personal capacity, yes, we would.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. Okay. So this isn't everything  
 21 the DEA did in this time period, correct?  
 22 A. Correct.  
 23 Q. Okay. All right. Moving on.  
 24 Now, industry has talked about  
 25 their inability to get access to ARCOS data

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1029

1 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 2 form.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. And you haven't taken those  
 5 actions based on data from other registrants,  
 6 correct?  
 7 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 8 form. Vague.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 11 Q. Right.  
 12 So just to be perfectly clear,  
 13 you didn't expect Cardinal to know what  
 14 McKesson or AmerisourceBergen was supplying  
 15 to a customer, correct?  
 16 A. Correct.  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 19 Q. Is it the DEA's experience that  
 20 suspicious orders filled by manufacturers,  
 21 distributors and pharmacies were suspicious  
 22 in their own right without anybody else's  
 23 data?  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 25 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1028

1 on other distributors, correct?  
 2 Do you remember those  
 3 questions?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Okay. Now, isn't it true that  
 6 even without information on a competitor's  
 7 orders, that registrants can identify  
 8 suspicious orders and potential diversion?  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 10 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 11 THE WITNESS: So essentially  
 12 their own data.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. Yes.  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Okay. And when you've taken --  
 17 when you, the DEA, has taken enforcement  
 18 actions or entered into settlement agreements  
 19 with registrants, you've looked at their own  
 20 data, correct?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. And what those registrants  
 23 should have known or did know about their own  
 24 customers, correct?  
 25 A. Correct.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1030

1 Vague.  
 2 MR. RUIZ: Foundation.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. And when distributors take on  
 6 or registrants take on a new customer, DEA  
 7 recommends that they ask whether that  
 8 customer uses other distributors, correct?  
 9 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 10 form. Foundation.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. And with dispensing data -- I'm  
 14 sorry.  
 15 And they also -- the DEA also  
 16 recommends that a registrant obtain -- or a  
 17 distributor -- let me try that again.  
 18 DEA also recommends that a  
 19 distributor obtain dispensing data from a  
 20 pharmacy before they take them on as a  
 21 customer, correct?  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 23 Foundation. Vague as to time.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Yes, if they can  
 25 get it.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1031

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. Okay. And with dispensing  
 3 data, it would be obvious to a distributor if  
 4 the pharmacy received controlled substances  
 5 from more than one distributor, correct?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 7 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the scope  
 9 of the Touhy authorization.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Join in the  
 11 scope objection.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Could you run  
 13 that by me again?  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. Yeah, let me try to be clearer  
 16 in my question.  
 17 If you get the dispensing  
 18 data -- if a distributor gets the dispensing  
 19 data from a customer and it gets more  
 20 controlled substances than that distributor  
 21 supplies, then the distributor knows that  
 22 it's getting controlled substances from other  
 23 distributors, correct?  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 25 Foundation. Calls for speculation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1033

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Calls  
 2 for speculation.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Yes, they should  
 4 be.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 6 Q. They should?  
 7 A. They should.  
 8 Q. A distributor should ask?  
 9 A. Should ask for it.  
 10 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. And if a pharmacy directed a  
 13 distributor that it should not -- or could  
 14 not go into its store and talk with its  
 15 personnel or get a feel for that store,  
 16 should that be another red flag to that  
 17 distributor?  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 20 hypothetical.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. Okay. And that's true whether  
 24 it's a chain pharmacy or an independent  
 25 pharmacy, correct?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1032

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1034

1 Outside the scope.  
 2 THE WITNESS: It could be from  
 3 another distributor, or it could be  
 4 from another pharmacy selling stuff to  
 5 them. So it's not necessarily another  
 6 distributor. It could be another  
 7 registrant that's selling them.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. Okay. But it's another  
 10 supplier other than -- or distributor,  
 11 correct?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. Now, if a pharmacy won't  
 16 provide dispensing information to a  
 17 distributor, would that be a red flag that  
 18 the distributor needs to look more closely at  
 19 that customer?  
 20 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 21 form. Vague as to time.  
 22 MS. MAINIGI: Scope. Outside  
 23 the scope of the Touhy authorization.  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 25 hypothetical.

1 MR. EPPICH: Same objections.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. Now, distributors have  
 5 information on both controlled and  
 6 noncontrolled substances that are ordered by  
 7 a customer, correct?  
 8 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 9 Foundation. Form and vague.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 12 Q. And that lets them see where a  
 13 customer's order of controlled substances is  
 14 disproportionate to its other orders,  
 15 correct?  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 17 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 18 Vague.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 21 Q. And so if a customer is  
 22 ordering a lot of opioids and very little  
 23 antibiotics or diabetes medicine, that would  
 24 be one potential red flag of diversion,  
 25 correct?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1035

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 2 Foundation. Calls for a legal  
 3 conclusion.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, it could  
 5 potentially be a red flag.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. A red flag?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. Okay. And it's also true that  
 10 pharmacies that order a certain mix of drugs  
 11 that are abused together, that that can be  
 12 another red flag of potential diversion,  
 13 correct?  
 14 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 15 Foundation. Calls for a legal  
 16 conclusion.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 19 Q. Now, distributors have that  
 20 data on other noncontrolled substance orders,  
 21 correct?  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 23 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 25 for speculation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1037

1 well.  
 2 Q. Okay. But you don't routinely  
 3 get antibiotics or other non-diverted or  
 4 abused drugs, correct?  
 5 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Asked  
 6 and answered. Form.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. And DEA doesn't have  
 10 prescribing information in ARCOS, correct?  
 11 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 12 Vague.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 15 Q. But that information is  
 16 certainly useful in detecting suspicious  
 17 orders or potential diversion, correct?  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Calls  
 19 for a legal conclusion. Form.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. Is DEA aware that registrants  
 23 have information -- have access to  
 24 information on cash payments that are  
 25 received by pharmacies?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1036

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1038

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. But DEA doesn't get reporting  
 4 from distributors on noncontrolled substances  
 5 ordered by customers, correct?  
 6 A. No, we do not.  
 7 We do have some distributors  
 8 that have told us -- like now everybody is  
 9 looking at gabapentin, so the distributors  
 10 have said, "We are going to take a harder  
 11 look at that, that one."  
 12 Q. Okay. But in general, and  
 13 certainly over the time period we've been  
 14 talking about from 1996 until now, you --  
 15 A. There's been -- I mean, there's  
 16 been other substances that they've said --  
 17 you know, I remember ketamine. That was one  
 18 they said, oh, it was not a noncontrol and we  
 19 made it controlled.  
 20 So there's been other drugs  
 21 that they have stepped up and said, you know,  
 22 "We need to keep an eye on these. We're  
 23 going to -- can we put them in the controlled  
 24 substance cage because we are seeing that?"  
 25 So we have had those dialogs with them as

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 2 Calls for speculation.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 4 for speculation.  
 5 THE WITNESS: I believe we do.  
 6 I believe they do.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. They do?  
 9 A. Yeah.  
 10 Q. And does DEA have that  
 11 information?  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 13 THE WITNESS: If we subpoena  
 14 it.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. Okay. But not in the regular  
 17 course --  
 18 A. No.  
 19 Q. -- of identifying potential  
 20 diversion?  
 21 A. Right.  
 22 Q. Now, does ARCOS data tell you  
 23 whether a customer is near a hospital or a  
 24 cancer center or a hospice treatment  
 25 facility?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1039

1 A. No, it's just transactional  
 2 data.  
 3 Q. Okay. But distributors and  
 4 manufacturers would learn that information in  
 5 their due diligence on customers, correct?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 7 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. Okay. And when you get, for  
 11 instance, a -- when you, DEA, gets, for  
 12 instance, a big stack of ingredient limit  
 13 reports, you can't tell from that whether  
 14 orders of large numbers are by facilities  
 15 that are near hospitals or oncology centers  
 16 or anything like that, correct?  
 17 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 18 form.  
 19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could  
 20 you repeat it?  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. So when you get, you know, a  
 23 big stack of excess order reports or  
 24 ingredient limit reports, you can't tell if a  
 25 large order is from a customer that's near an

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1041

1 Okay. And this represents the  
 2 official position of the Department of  
 3 Justice and DEA, correct?  
 4 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 5 Foundation.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. Okay. Turning to page 4,  
 9 please. The middle paragraph, second  
 10 sentence says, "Release of the personally  
 11 identifiable information of individual  
 12 registrants without their consent would  
 13 violate the Privacy Act."  
 14 Do you see where I'm reading?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. "Therefore, DOJ objects to the  
 17 production thereof under its Touhy  
 18 regulations. Disclosure would improperly  
 19 reveal trade secrets without the owners'  
 20 consent, and, therefore, the DOJ objects to  
 21 the production thereof under its Touhy  
 22 regulations," citing them. "Production of  
 23 this data would reveal specific details  
 24 regarding the scope and breadth of their  
 25 market share, which is likely to cause

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1040

1 oncology center or a hospital, for instance,  
 2 correct?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 4 form.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Correct. From  
 6 the reports, you cannot.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 8 Q. Does the DEA get chargeback  
 9 data?  
 10 A. No.  
 11 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 12 P57 marked for identification.)  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. All right. Let's go to the  
 15 letter. Exhibit 57.  
 16 This is a letter from the  
 17 DEA -- I'm sorry, from the Department of  
 18 Justice to the Honorable Dan A. Polster dated  
 19 January 30, 2018.  
 20 Have you seen this letter?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Okay. And it's signed by  
 23 Demetra Ashley --  
 24 A. Yes.  
 25 Q. -- is that correct?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1042

1 manufacturers and distributors substantial  
 2 competitive harm."  
 3 Have I read that correctly?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Okay. And it goes on to say,  
 6 "In Freedom of Information Act litigation,  
 7 registrants have articulated the competitive  
 8 harm that would result from the release of  
 9 this information in several ways. For  
 10 example, registrants have expressed concern  
 11 that ARCos information, if made publicly  
 12 available, could be used by competitors to  
 13 determine market share and sales trends in  
 14 specific areas and would enable competitors  
 15 to target existing customers and attempt to  
 16 take away business. For" --  
 17 So have I read all of that  
 18 correctly?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. "For this reason, registrants  
 21 have repeatedly asserted that they rely on  
 22 DEA to protect the confidential business  
 23 information that they report to DEA through  
 24 ARCos."  
 25 Have I read that correctly?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1043

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. And is it the DEA's experience  
 3 that registrants have objected to sharing  
 4 ARCOS data with their competitors?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Object to form and  
 7 foundation.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. All right. You can put that  
 10 aside.  
 11 So all registrants have the  
 12 same duty to maintain effective controls to  
 13 protect diversion and to detect, report and  
 14 stop shipment of suspicious orders; is that  
 15 correct?  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Calls  
 17 for a legal conclusion.  
 18 MS. FUMERTON: Objection.  
 19 Form.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 22 Q. And I think you testified  
 23 before that the obligation depends on where  
 24 you sit in the supply chain.  
 25 Do you remember that?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1043

1 diversion you can see from where you sit,  
 2 correct?  
 3 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 4 Calls for a legal conclusion. Vague.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. And if a registrant has  
 8 information that would alert it to diversion,  
 9 it has an obligation under the Controlled  
 10 Substances Act to use that information to  
 11 prevent diversion, correct?  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Object to form.  
 13 Calls for a legal conclusion. Vague.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. And you can't be like that  
 17 monkey, hiding your eyes --  
 18 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. -- and say, "We only use that  
 21 data for marketing" --  
 22 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 24 Q. -- "or accounting."  
 25 You have to use that data for

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1044

1 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 2 THE WITNESS: You mean in terms  
 3 of --  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. Let me put it a different way  
 6 rather than focusing on what you testified  
 7 to.  
 8 Is it true that your  
 9 obligations are the same, but what you may  
 10 observe and have data on depends on where you  
 11 are in the supply chain, correct?  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 13 form. Vague.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. So you have the same  
 17 obligation -- or a registrant has the same  
 18 obligation to report and prevent diversion,  
 19 regardless of where they are in the supply  
 20 chain, correct?  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 22 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. And the difference is what

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1046

1 compliance, too, correct?  
 2 MR. EPPICH: Objection.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 5 Q. Before manufacturers sell  
 6 opioids to a distributor, that manufacturer  
 7 must make sure that the distributor has an  
 8 adequate and effective suspicious order  
 9 monitoring program, correct?  
 10 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 11 Form. Foundation.  
 12 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 14 Q. And that would include doing a  
 15 site visit of the distributor, correct?  
 16 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 17 Form.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. And examining its suspicious  
 21 order monitoring program, correct?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. And if a manufacturer sees  
 24 evidence that a distributor is shipping and  
 25 failing to report suspicious orders, that

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1047

1 should suggest to the manufacturer that the  
 2 distributor does not have effective controls,  
 3 correct?  
 4 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 5 Form.  
 6 MS. MACKAY: Incomplete  
 7 hypothetical.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. And if the information a  
 11 manufacturer has available to them points to  
 12 diversion by prescribers, by pharmacies, a  
 13 manufacturer has an obligation to notify DEA  
 14 of those prescribers and pharmacies, correct?  
 15 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 16 Form. Incomplete hypothetical.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 19 Q. And does a manufacturer comply  
 20 with its obligations to report suspicious --  
 21 I'm sorry.  
 22 Does a manufacturer comply with  
 23 the Controlled Substances Act when it reports  
 24 that potential diversion to its distributor  
 25 but not the DEA?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1049

1 P58 marked for identification.)  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 3 Q. Exhibit 58. It is  
 4 DEA\_Rannazzisi, a lot of zeros, 6060. It's  
 5 titled "Declaration of Michael Arpaio."  
 6 Do you recognize this document?  
 7 A. No.  
 8 Q. Okay. Do you know who Michael  
 9 Arpaio is?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. And who is that?  
 12 A. He is a former DEA diversion  
 13 investigator.  
 14 Q. Okay. And if you turn to  
 15 page 2, backside. Now -- I'm sorry, go back  
 16 to the first page, the caption.  
 17 Can you read the caption for  
 18 this, in the matter of Cardinal Health?  
 19 A. Cardinal Health.  
 20 Q. Okay. I'm sorry, now read  
 21 paragraph 5, if you would, please.  
 22 A. "I told Mr." --  
 23 Is it Moni?  
 24 Q. Yes.  
 25 A. "I told Mr. Moni that due

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1048

1 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 2 Form.  
 3 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, can  
 4 you run --  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 6 Q. So if the manufacturer only  
 7 tells its distributor and not the DEA, have  
 8 they satisfied their obligation under the  
 9 Controlled Substances Act?  
 10 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 11 Form.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 13 hypothetical.  
 14 THE WITNESS: No.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. Are distributors -- and I'm  
 17 sorry. Mr. Farrell asked you these questions  
 18 about chain pharmacies and whether there are  
 19 different compliance obligations for chain  
 20 pharmacies.  
 21 Do you remember that?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. And I just want to show you one  
 24 document.  
 25 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1050

1 diligence investigations must be performed on  
 2 all customers."  
 3 Q. And if you go back for one  
 4 second, if you read the top line of  
 5 paragraph 4, it may explain who Mr. Moni is.  
 6 A. "Consequently, on July 29,  
 7 2009, I spoke via teleconference to Mike  
 8 Moni, quality and regulatory affairs vice  
 9 president, anti-diversion and supply chain  
 10 services, who is headquartered in Cardinal  
 11 Health's Dublin, Ohio, facility but at the  
 12 time was in Washington, DC."  
 13 Q. Okay. You can stop there.  
 14 And I'm sorry, if you can pick  
 15 up where you were in paragraph 5.  
 16 A. Just start --  
 17 Q. Just start from the beginning  
 18 on paragraph 5.  
 19 A. "I told Mr. Moni that due  
 20 diligence investigations must be performed on  
 21 all customers, chain pharmacies included,  
 22 when it appears that suspicious high volume  
 23 orders of controlled substances are  
 24 requested, and questionnaires should be sent  
 25 to those -- to these chains.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1051

1 "Mr. Moni, in turn, stated that  
 2 QRA is unable to look at chain pharmacy  
 3 systems in order to identify problem areas  
 4 when there is not an order of interest or  
 5 their threshold is not exceeded. I repeated  
 6 the chain store due diligence reviews must  
 7 not be treated any differently than  
 8 independent retail pharmacy customers."  
 9 Q. In that last sentence that  
 10 "chain store due diligence reviews must not  
 11 be treated any differently than independent  
 12 retail pharmacy customers," does that  
 13 represent the view of the DEA?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: Objection. Form.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 17 Q. And that is the guidance that  
 18 DEA gave to registrants, correct?  
 19 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to  
 20 form. Objection. Outside the scope  
 21 of the Touhy authorization.  
 22 Objection.  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Objection to the  
 24 prior question.  
 25 MS. MAINIGI: Objection to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1053

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. And distributors may not know  
 3 all of the pills that are going into an area,  
 4 but they certainly know what pills they're  
 5 sending, correct?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Objection to the  
 7 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 8 MS. MAINIGI: No foundation.  
 9 Outside the scope of the Touhy  
 10 authorization.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 13 Q. Are orders that are below a  
 14 threshold set by a distributor sometimes  
 15 suspicious, too?  
 16 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Calls  
 17 for a legal conclusion. Form. Vague.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes, they can be.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 20 Q. And should registrants be  
 21 reporting orders that are within threshold  
 22 but are still suspicious for other reasons?  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 24 Calls for a legal conclusion. Scope.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1052

1 prior question and there also to this  
 2 current question.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 4 Q. Go ahead.  
 5 That's the guidance that DEA  
 6 gave to registrants?  
 7 A. Correct.  
 8 Q. All right. Should distributors  
 9 be looking at all of the volume of opioids  
 10 they supply into a geographic area in  
 11 determining whether orders may be suspicious?  
 12 MR. EPPICH: Object to the  
 13 form. Foundation. Vague. Calls for  
 14 a legal conclusion.  
 15 THE WITNESS: It would  
 16 definitely help.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 18 Q. Okay. Meaning if they're  
 19 supplying in ways that are very  
 20 disproportionate to the population, that  
 21 should be a sign that they're not supplying  
 22 to a legitimate market, correct?  
 23 MR. EPPICH: Objection to the  
 24 form. Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Correct.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1054

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. If an order exceeds a threshold  
 3 set by a registrant, is it no longer  
 4 suspicious if the registrant cuts the order  
 5 to threshold and ships it anyway?  
 6 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 7 Incomplete hypothetical. Calls for a  
 8 legal conclusion. Vague.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the scope  
 10 of the Touhy authorization.  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 12 hypothetical.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat  
 14 it?  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 16 Q. Yes. Let me do it as an  
 17 example.  
 18 If the threshold says that an  
 19 order of 10,000 dosage units exceeds  
 20 threshold and a customer orders 50,000 dosage  
 21 units, can the distributor just cut the order  
 22 to 10,000 units and ship it without  
 23 investigating whether it's suspicious or not?  
 24 MR. EPPICH: Objection. Form.  
 25 Incomplete hypothetical. Calls for a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1055

1 legal conclusion and vague.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Well, in your  
 3 hypothetical it sounded like it was  
 4 already triggered as a suspicious  
 5 order, so immediately upon discovery  
 6 they were supposed to tell us anyway  
 7 that this happened.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 9 Q. And shipping less of it doesn't  
 10 make it not suspicious anymore. If it's a  
 11 suspicious order, it's a suspicious order,  
 12 correct?  
 13 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.  
 14 Calls for a legal conclusion.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Right. So they  
 16 can either not ship it or they can  
 17 investigate to determine -- to  
 18 alleviate the suspicions that they  
 19 have.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 21 Q. Okay. Let's go to...  
 22 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 23 P59 marked for identification.)  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 25 Q. Okay. This is exhibit -- can

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1057

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 2 Q. And turning the page, I believe  
 3 you were asked to read the last sentence of  
 4 the middle paragraph, "The DEA needs every  
 5 tool."  
 6 Can you just read the first  
 7 part of that paragraph, too, so we have a  
 8 complete record and not just an  
 9 out-of-context sentence?  
 10 MR. EPPICH: Object to that  
 11 commentary.  
 12 THE WITNESS: "The DEA needs  
 13 every tool it can to combat the opioid  
 14 crisis. DEA supports changing the  
 15 Ensuring Patient Access and Effective  
 16 Drug Enforcement Act to allow DEA to  
 17 more effectively stop bad actors from  
 18 engaging in opioid diversion. We are  
 19 dealing with very dangerous drugs that  
 20 can result in addiction and even  
 21 death."  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 23 Q. Okay. I think that completes  
 24 the record. You read the last sentence  
 25 previously.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1056

1 you see the number, Mr. Prevoznik? I forgot  
 2 to check it.  
 3 A. 59.  
 4 Q. Okay. And do you recognize  
 5 this as the testimony of Demetra Ashley from  
 6 the Office of Diversion Control at DEA?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. I believe it was an exhibit in  
 9 the first two days of your deposition.  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. All right. And it's dated  
 12 December 12, 2017, correct?  
 13 A. Correct.  
 14 Q. Okay. So I believe that  
 15 Cardinal's counsel read you some of this, and  
 16 I just want to complete the record on it.  
 17 So, first, if you could turn to  
 18 page 7.  
 19 Under the title "Ensuring  
 20 Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement  
 21 Act," first sentence, "The United States is  
 22 currently facing an opioid epidemic."  
 23 Is that the view of the DEA?  
 24 A. Yes.  
 25 MR. EPPICH: Objection to form.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1058

1 All right. Let's now go to  
 2 the...  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm going to  
 4 ask for our lunch break in a minute.  
 5 MS. SINGER: Okay. I'm just  
 6 about done.  
 7 (Prevoznik Plaintiff's Exhibit  
 8 P60 marked for identification.)  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 10 Q. Okay. Exhibit 60.  
 11 And this is  
 12 DEA\_Rannazzisi\_00003482. And that title page  
 13 is "Prescription Opioids to Heroin: A  
 14 Natural Progression, June 14, 2014, Joseph  
 15 Rannazzisi."  
 16 Do you recognize this document?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. And what do you recognize it  
 19 as?  
 20 A. Mr. Rannazzisi's presentation.  
 21 Q. Okay. And that was an official  
 22 DEA presentation, correct?  
 23 A. Correct.  
 24 Q. Okay. And there aren't slide  
 25 numbers.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1059

1 Do we have that tabbed?  
 2 If you could go to the second  
 3 tab, please, which is titled "Migration of  
 4 Pain Clinics."  
 5 Are you at that page with a  
 6 map?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. Okay. Can you explain what  
 9 this map represents in terms of DEA's  
 10 enforcement?  
 11 MR. O'CONNOR: Objection.  
 12 Foundation.  
 13 MS. MAINIGI: Outside the scope  
 14 of the Touhy authorization.  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You can  
 16 answer this question, but this will be  
 17 the last question before our lunch  
 18 break.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Okay.  
 20 What this means is after we  
 21 took the enforcement actions we did in  
 22 Florida, this was what the pain -- the  
 23 bad pain clinics did, the rogue pain  
 24 clinics did, was they went -- moved --  
 25 as you can see the directions they

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1061

1 AmerisourceBergen in this litigation.  
 2 Before we begin, I do want to  
 3 sincerely thank you for your patience over  
 4 last two and a half days. I know it's been a  
 5 lot, and it is appreciated.  
 6 I want to start my questioning  
 7 with the testimony you provided relating to  
 8 after-the-fact reporting of suspicious  
 9 orders.  
 10 Okay?  
 11 A. Uh-huh.  
 12 Q. All right. And when we're  
 13 talking about after-the-fact reporting of  
 14 suspicious orders, what we are talking about  
 15 is registrants who report suspicious -- who  
 16 ship suspicious orders after they've been  
 17 reported to DEA, correct?  
 18 A. After they reported it?  
 19 Q. Yes.  
 20 After-the-fact reporting is  
 21 when the suspicious order has been shipped  
 22 and then reported to DEA; is that correct?  
 23 A. Those were excessive purchases.  
 24 Q. Okay.  
 25 A. So it was after-the-fact sales.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1060

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1062

1 moved into. They moved into states  
 2 that had weak laws governing pain  
 3 clinics. So this was the movement of  
 4 the rogue pain clinics from Florida  
 5 out.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. SINGER:  
 7 Q. Okay. And this reflects DEA's  
 8 experience that when you take enforcement  
 9 action someplace, the diversion can move into  
 10 other areas, correct?  
 11 A. Correct.  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: Objection.  
 13 Outside the scope. Vague.  
 14 VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. We're  
 15 going off the record. The time is  
 16 12:46.  
 17 (Off the record at 12:46 p.m.)  
 18 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back  
 19 on the record. Beginning of Media  
 20 File 5. The time is 1:37.  
 21 EXAMINATION  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 23 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, good afternoon.  
 24 My name is Joe Mahady. I, along with my  
 25 colleague, Robert Nicholas, are counsel for

1 Q. Okay. And my understanding of  
 2 your testimony is that the DEA has always  
 3 interpreted orders to mean prior to shipment;  
 4 is that correct?  
 5 A. Correct.  
 6 Q. All right. And that the DEA  
 7 has consistently provided the guidance --  
 8 that guidance to registrants, correct?  
 9 A. Correct.  
 10 Q. All right. And that the DEA  
 11 has never told registrants that  
 12 after-the-fact reporting is compliant with  
 13 federal law; is that correct?  
 14 A. Well, the use of the term -- of  
 15 the absolute "never," there might be an  
 16 employee that did, but DEA policy has always  
 17 been --  
 18 Q. Okay. So nobody from DEA  
 19 headquarters has ever told a registrant, to  
 20 your knowledge, that after-the-fact reporting  
 21 is compliant with federal law, correct?  
 22 A. Well, again, you started it  
 23 with the "never" -- did somebody at DEA  
 24 headquarters ever do it. So I'm -- I can't  
 25 say that somebody didn't say something, but I

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1063

1 can say DEA policy is that they should not.  
 2 Q. Okay. I appreciate that.  
 3 And I believe you testified  
 4 that the DEA has consistently advised  
 5 registrants that they should not ship an  
 6 order that they report as suspicious; is that  
 7 correct?  
 8 A. Correct.  
 9 Q. And when you say  
 10 "consistently," you were referring to the  
 11 time period from 1971 when the Controlled  
 12 Substances Act was passed until present day;  
 13 is that right?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. So approximately a 50-year  
 16 period. Your testimony is that the DEA  
 17 guidance on that point has been consistent,  
 18 correct?  
 19 A. Correct.  
 20 Q. All right. You joined the DEA  
 21 in 1991, correct?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. In my home city of  
 24 Philadelphia?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1065

1 regulations that haven't changed since then.  
 2 Q. Okay.  
 3 A. So that's what I relied on.  
 4 Q. So you relied -- for the period  
 5 from 1971 to 1991, you relied entirely on the  
 6 statute and the regulation, correct?  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 8 Argumentative. Mischaracterizes prior  
 9 testimony.  
 10 THE WITNESS: No, because we  
 11 went through some of the letters that  
 12 I had seen in the 1980s in which those  
 13 topics were discussed in there.  
 14 But I also know that Burles  
 15 Vulcom [phonetic], there was a press  
 16 release that they had to pay a heavy  
 17 fine back in the 19 -- mid-1980s  
 18 because they weren't reporting  
 19 suspicious orders.  
 20 So I was reviewing documents  
 21 that would show what was DEA's  
 22 position and what did we say. So I  
 23 was looking at correspondence, any  
 24 correspondence, I could find in the  
 25 1980s, 1990s, anything that showed

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1064

1 Q. Okay.  
 2 A. Where you from?  
 3 Q. Philadelphia.  
 4 Where?  
 5 A. Yeah.  
 6 Q. Well, now I'm in the 'burbs.  
 7 We had to move. But I was in city.  
 8 So -- and you joined  
 9 headquarters in 2012, correct?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. Okay. So I want to understand  
 12 a little bit better how you can testify that  
 13 the guidance was consistent for that entire  
 14 50-year period.  
 15 Okay?  
 16 A. Sure.  
 17 Q. Okay. So in preparing for your  
 18 deposition as the representative from the  
 19 DEA, who did you speak with that -- well, let  
 20 me back up.  
 21 You don't have any firsthand  
 22 knowledge of the guidance that the DEA  
 23 offered from 1971 until you joined the DEA in  
 24 1991, correct?  
 25 A. I have the statute and the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1066

1 that consistent -- what did we say,  
 2 what was our policy.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 4 Q. Okay. And what did we say  
 5 regarding the guidance relating to reporting  
 6 a suspicious order and then shipping it.  
 7 That's what we're talking about specifically,  
 8 right?  
 9 A. Right.  
 10 Q. Okay. Did you speak with  
 11 anyone at the -- in preparation for your  
 12 30(b)(6), did you speak with anyone at the  
 13 DEA who was knowledgeable about the guidance  
 14 offered by the DEA on that issue from 1971 to  
 15 1980?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm going to  
 17 object and note for the record that  
 18 the witness had a prep sheet which was  
 19 to stay with his prep materials that  
 20 has not been provided to him today.  
 21 MR. MAHADY: Okay. And that  
 22 was a prep sheet that the Department  
 23 of Justice brought with them last  
 24 time, so it's not a document that we  
 25 were to bring. So --

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1067

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: No, it was a  
 2 document that was marked as an  
 3 exhibit, provided to everyone and kept  
 4 with the witness himself, kept with  
 5 the court reporter, so he could rely  
 6 on them.  
 7 MR. MAHADY: Okay.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: This  
 9 specifically listed his prep.  
 10 MR. MAHADY: Okay. That's  
 11 fine.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And so now  
 13 he's going on memory, where we  
 14 specifically prepared an exhibit for  
 15 you.  
 16 MR. MAHADY: I appreciate that.  
 17 MS. MAINIGI: We'll try to find  
 18 it. I think the exhibits went with  
 19 the prior court reporter, so I think  
 20 that's what happened.  
 21 MR. MAHADY: Okay.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 23 Q. In preparation for your  
 24 30(b)(6), you did not speak with Michael  
 25 Mapes, correct?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1069

1 18 and went to 20.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 3 Q. Okay. And in preparing for  
 4 your deposition as a 30(b)(6) on behalf of  
 5 the DEA, how many representatives from field  
 6 offices did you speak with?  
 7 A. Probably about 10 to 12.  
 8 Q. Okay.  
 9 A. Sort of off the top of my head.  
 10 Q. And how many of those  
 11 individuals worked at field offices in the  
 12 1990s?  
 13 A. Worked in the field offices?  
 14 Q. Correct.  
 15 A. Eight to ten of them.  
 16 Q. Okay. Mr. Prevoznik, are you  
 17 aware that the DEA has, in fact, approved a  
 18 suspicious order monitoring system where  
 19 suspicious orders were to be reported after  
 20 the purchase was complete?  
 21 A. No.  
 22 Q. Okay. Would it surprise you  
 23 that the DEA has approved a suspicious order  
 24 monitoring system where suspicious orders  
 25 were to be reported after the purchase has

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1068

1 A. No.  
 2 Q. And you did not speak with Kyle  
 3 Wright, correct?  
 4 A. No.  
 5 Q. There was a reference to a Tom  
 6 Gitchel earlier today; is that right?  
 7 A. Tom Gitchel, yes.  
 8 Q. And who is Tom Gitchel?  
 9 A. Tom Gitchel was a senior  
 10 manager within the diversion program at DEA.  
 11 Q. Okay. And did you speak with  
 12 Tom Gitchel in preparation for providing  
 13 testimony on behalf of the DEA?  
 14 A. No.  
 15 Q. Okay. How about Patricia Good?  
 16 Did you speak with Patricia Good?  
 17 A. No.  
 18 Q. How many field offices does the  
 19 DEA have?  
 20 A. Currently we have 23.  
 21 Q. Okay. And do you know how many  
 22 field offices the DEA had in the 1990s?  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 24 Scope.  
 25 THE WITNESS: I believe it was

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1070

1 been complete?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to  
 3 form.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yeah.  
 5 (Prevoznik Exhibit 22 marked  
 6 for identification.)  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 8 Q. Okay. I'm going to mark this  
 9 as Prevoznik 22.  
 10 Mr. Prevoznik, let me know when  
 11 you've had a chance to read this.  
 12 A. Okay.  
 13 Q. Okay.  
 14 MR. FARRELL: Before you do so,  
 15 I'm going to place an objection on the  
 16 record. This is correspondence dated  
 17 1998 between Bergen Brunswig  
 18 Corporation and the DEA, and the scope  
 19 of this document violates CMO 2, where  
 20 the defendants requested and the Court  
 21 granted a limitation with temporal  
 22 scope of discovery to 2006.  
 23 MR. MAHADY: This document was  
 24 produced to the DEA, was identified as  
 25 a document that Mr. Prevoznik reviewed

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1071

1 in preparing for his corporate  
 2 designee deposition today.  
 3 I will also note that the  
 4 plaintiffs spent a majority of their  
 5 questioning on issues that predate  
 6 2007, including using documentation  
 7 that was between DEA and other  
 8 registrants that was pre-2007.  
 9 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: Just to  
 10 clarify, you said produced to the DEA.  
 11 Did you mean by the DEA?  
 12 MR. MAHADY: From the DEA.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 14 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, this morning  
 15 Mr. Farrell asked you questions about  
 16 documents that bear a US DEA Bates number,  
 17 correct?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. All right. And those are  
 20 documents that the DEA has produced, correct?  
 21 A. Correct.  
 22 Q. Okay. And these were documents  
 23 that were in the custody and control of the  
 24 DEA, correct?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1073

1 record. It was Wednesday of this week  
 2 we received it.  
 3 MS. MAINIGI: Actually, it was  
 4 hand-delivered to Williams on Tuesday.  
 5 MR. MAHADY: Well, the point  
 6 isn't Tuesday or Wednesday, it's  
 7 that --  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: No, it was  
 9 hand-delivered. So you knew you had  
 10 represented previously that it was  
 11 Federal Express'd, but it wasn't.  
 12 MR. MAHADY: Okay. Well,  
 13 the -- I would just like to --  
 14 MS. MAINIGI: That's what I  
 15 understood.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And you were  
 17 wrong.  
 18 MR. MAHADY: -- note for the  
 19 record that this document was reviewed  
 20 by the witness in advance of the first  
 21 two days of his deposition and was  
 22 produced a month after the fact.  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And now you  
 24 have it. Go ahead and ask questions  
 25 about it.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1072

1 Q. Okay. Have you seen this  
 2 document before?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. When was the first time you saw  
 5 this document?  
 6 A. It was during my prep. I don't  
 7 have a specific date.  
 8 Q. Did you see -- so you've been  
 9 deposed on three separate days, correct?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. And the first two days of your  
 12 deposition were, I believe, April 17th and  
 13 April 18th.  
 14 Did you see this document  
 15 before you were deposed on April 17th and  
 16 April 18th?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Okay. Are you aware that the  
 19 Department of Justice did not produce this  
 20 document until Tuesday of this week?  
 21 A. No.  
 22 Q. Okay.  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: I believe it got  
 24 to us Wednesday.  
 25 MR. MAHADY: Correction for the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1074

1 MR. MAHADY: I will. Thank  
 2 you.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You're  
 4 welcome.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 6 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, can you please  
 7 direct your attention to the bottom of this  
 8 document?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. And before we get there, I'm  
 11 sorry, this document is dated what?  
 12 A. July 23, 1998.  
 13 Q. And this document was sent to,  
 14 while the name is redacted, the regulatory  
 15 compliance and security services of Bergen  
 16 Brunswig Corporation; is that correct?  
 17 A. Correct.  
 18 Q. And it's signed, or stamped, by  
 19 Patricia M. Good, chief liaison and policy  
 20 section; is that right?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Okay. Can you direct your  
 23 attention to the bottom of the page below the  
 24 section that has been redacted, and can you  
 25 please read for me the subject line?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1075

1 A. "Approved suspicious order  
 2 monitoring system."  
 3 Q. Okay. Now, if you can please  
 4 read to me for the record the first sentence  
 5 of the letter after "dear."  
 6 A. "This is to grant approval of  
 7 your request to implement on a nationwide  
 8 basis your newly developed system to identify  
 9 and report suspicious orders for controlled  
 10 substances and regulated chemicals."  
 11 Q. Okay. Can you -- so as  
 12 required by the federal regulations, correct?  
 13 A. Oh, I'm sorry, yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. Can you read the next  
 15 sentence, please?  
 16 A. "DEA managers who have been  
 17 involved with the testing of the system have  
 18 relied -- have relayed their positive  
 19 opinions regarding its ability to provide  
 20 information in a fashion which is not only  
 21 useful overall but is also responsive to the  
 22 needs of individual DEA offices."  
 23 Q. Okay. And we can agree that  
 24 this is an explicit approval from the DEA of  
 25 a particular system, correct?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1077

1 monitoring system," the position of the DEA  
 2 is that this was not an approval of the  
 3 system; is that correct?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 5 Argumentative. Asked and answered.  
 6 You can answer again.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Can you please  
 8 repeat it?  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 10 Q. Notwithstanding the fact that  
 11 the subject line of this letter is "approve  
 12 suspicious order monitoring system," it is  
 13 the position of the DEA here today, 20-some  
 14 years later, that this was not an approval of  
 15 the actual program itself; is that correct?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 17 objections.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's not  
 19 what the letter says. The letter says  
 20 we approve your request to implement  
 21 your system on a nationwide basis.  
 22 Your system, Bergen Brunswig system.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 24 Q. And do you know if that system  
 25 was developed in coordination with the DEA?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1076

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 2 Mischaracterizes the document.  
 3 THE WITNESS: No, it's a --  
 4 it's a granting -- they asked could  
 5 they implement this on a nationwide --  
 6 their newly designed system. So it's  
 7 this particular registrant, Bergen  
 8 Brunswig, who developed their own  
 9 system and asked can we -- can we  
 10 apply this nationwide.  
 11 And we said, yes, you may apply  
 12 it nationwide.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 14 Q. Okay. So --  
 15 A. It's not approving the system.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let the  
 17 witness finish his answer.  
 18 MR. MAHADY: I appreciate that.  
 19 THE WITNESS: It's just  
 20 approving the fact that they can now  
 21 put it nationwide.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 23 Q. Okay. So notwithstanding the  
 24 fact that the subject line of the letter is,  
 25 "Subject: Approve suspicious order

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1078

1 A. Well, it appears that we had  
 2 some input into it, so it's no different than  
 3 when I previously testified that you have --  
 4 the regulations require the registrant to  
 5 design. So this is designing it.  
 6 So when -- as I said earlier  
 7 today, when we go in to listen to the design  
 8 or what is the system that you're going to  
 9 implement, DEA is in listening mode, we will  
 10 make suggestions.  
 11 If we -- as we listen to it, we  
 12 will make suggestions: Oh, you may want to  
 13 think of this; you may want to think of that.  
 14 Q. Okay.  
 15 A. So then it jumps to the  
 16 operational side. So you now have the  
 17 design, but now you have to operate it. So  
 18 what is the operation, what was actually --  
 19 how did the system operate.  
 20 And that is the registrant  
 21 running that system, not DEA.  
 22 Q. Okay. So the DEA approved the  
 23 design of the system but not the operation;  
 24 is that what you're saying?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1079

1 Mischaracterizes his prior testimony.  
 2 THE WITNESS: No, we said we  
 3 approve the request to implement the  
 4 system nationwide.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 6 Q. Okay. So in the eyes of DEA,  
 7 there's a distinction between approving the  
 8 system and approving the nationwide  
 9 implementation of a system.  
 10 Do I understand you correctly?  
 11 A. Well, I understand the request  
 12 seems to be that they asked, "Can we put this  
 13 nationwide?" and we said, "Yes, go ahead."  
 14 (Prevoznik Exhibit 23 marked  
 15 for identification.)  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 17 Q. Okay. I'm going to mark the  
 18 next document as Prevoznik 23.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Do you have a  
 20 copy for me?  
 21 MR. MAHADY: I do.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait till I  
 23 get my copy before you answer  
 24 questions.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Sure.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1081

1 no response.  
 2 So I'm going to ask you to  
 3 instruct Mr. Farrell, who is trying to  
 4 slow down and impede the questioning,  
 5 that he not continue to raise this  
 6 same issue with every document that's  
 7 introduced.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'll note  
 9 that we let them ask and we're letting  
 10 you ask, but it appears that you all  
 11 had a copy of what you were  
 12 complaining you didn't receive a copy  
 13 of for a long time, so...  
 14 MR. MAHADY: And I'll represent  
 15 to the Department of Justice that the  
 16 copy that the Department of Justice  
 17 produced is different in a material  
 18 way than the copy that was in the  
 19 possession of AmerisourceBergen.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 21 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, are you ready?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. Okay.  
 24 MR. FARRELL: Hold on. Am I  
 25 being instructed not to lodge

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1080

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1082

1 MR. FARRELL: Again, for the  
 2 record, I'm going to place an  
 3 objection. This is not a document  
 4 produced by the DEA. This is a  
 5 document bearing the ABDC Bates number  
 6 in the bottom right-hand corner, a  
 7 document dated 1996.  
 8 The defendants argued for and  
 9 received an order preventing the  
 10 plaintiffs from conducting discovery  
 11 on DEA communications with the  
 12 wholesalers prior to 2006, and yet now  
 13 they're attempting to introduce  
 14 selected documents on the very subject  
 15 matter.  
 16 So we reserve our right to make  
 17 a request to the Court to allow us to  
 18 reopen discovery in this regard.  
 19 MR. MAHADY: Special Master  
 20 Cohen, this issue has been addressed  
 21 in e-mail correspondence to you this  
 22 week. I believe it -- the last  
 23 request from you was to plaintiffs  
 24 asking that this resolve the issue.  
 25 That was over two days ago. There was

1 objections?  
 2 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: You  
 3 certainly can lodge an objection in  
 4 the same way that the defense were  
 5 objecting to questioning by the  
 6 plaintiffs.  
 7 What I suggest you do, though,  
 8 is find a which to say an objection in  
 9 five words or less.  
 10 MR. FARRELL: If I can have my  
 11 objections preserved for the record,  
 12 then I won't need to object at all.  
 13 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: Will you  
 14 give him a continuing objection on  
 15 that basis?  
 16 MR. MAHADY: That's fine.  
 17 Can we go off the record?  
 18 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off  
 19 record. The time is 1:57.  
 20 (Off the record at 1:57 p.m.)  
 21 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back  
 22 on the record.  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Go ahead,  
 24 back on the record.  
 25 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1083

1 the record. Beginning of Media  
 2 File 6. Time is 1:58.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Mr. Mahady,  
 4 you had represented that there were  
 5 significant differences. Do you want  
 6 to explain those? Because I have your  
 7 production right here, and the only  
 8 difference is it seems that you had an  
 9 unredacted version of this document.  
 10 MR. MAHADY: Sure,  
 11 Mr. Finkelstein. I'd just like to  
 12 start first with that it's not the  
 13 same document that I just made that  
 14 representation relating to. I was  
 15 referring to the 1998 letter.  
 16 In the copy of the document  
 17 that was produced by the Department of  
 18 Justice, there are redactions, and  
 19 redactions in areas of the document  
 20 where there is no text in the version  
 21 that was in the possession of  
 22 AmerisourceBergen.  
 23 I will also note that at the  
 24 bottom of the version that was  
 25 produced by the Department of Justice,

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1085

1 I think you have three hours to  
 2 ask the witness about the redacted  
 3 draft.  
 4 MR. MAHADY: And I think we're  
 5 talking about the document from  
 6 September 30, 1996, that's before the  
 7 witness.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 9 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, can you please  
 10 read the first paragraph of this letter --  
 11 before we get there.  
 12 Thomas Gitchel. Thomas Gitchel  
 13 is identified as the chief liaison and policy  
 14 section of the DEA, correct?  
 15 A. Correct.  
 16 Q. And he held that position in  
 17 1996?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. Now, if a registrant has  
 20 questions about the regulation or the DEA's  
 21 interpretation of the regulations, those  
 22 questions are directed to the liaison and  
 23 policy section of the DEA, correct?  
 24 A. Correct.  
 25 Q. And is the chief the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1084

1 there is a subject line, a subject,  
 2 "approve suspicious order monitoring  
 3 system," which is material and  
 4 relevant.  
 5 I would also like to note for  
 6 the record that the version of the  
 7 documents that are in possession of  
 8 AmerisourceBergen were provided to the  
 9 Department of Justice yesterday  
 10 afternoon around one o'clock for  
 11 purposes of completeness and in  
 12 advance of today's deposition, and I  
 13 received no response from anyone at  
 14 the DOJ.  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: So we had  
 16 fewer than 24 hours.  
 17 But what I'm seeing is two  
 18 letters dated July 23, 1998. One is  
 19 addressed to Chris Zimmerman; the  
 20 other is addressed to a redacted name.  
 21 One says, "Dear Mr. Zimmerman," the  
 22 other says, "redacted." In every  
 23 other respect, apart from the  
 24 redactions and the subject, they  
 25 appear to be identical.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1086

1 highest-ranking member of that section?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. Okay. This letter dated  
 4 September 30, 1996, to Thomas Gitchel was  
 5 sent by Chris Zimmerman of Bergen Brunswig.  
 6 Do you know Chris Zimmerman?  
 7 A. I know the name.  
 8 Q. Okay.  
 9 A. I don't know if we've ever met.  
 10 Q. Okay. I want to start -- and  
 11 I'll actually read the first paragraph for  
 12 purposes of time.  
 13 "The purposes of this letter is  
 14 to introduce the Drug Enforcement  
 15 Administration to an innovative new system  
 16 under development by Bergen Brunswig Drug  
 17 Company to monitor and report customer orders  
 18 of controlled substances which fit the  
 19 suspicious order criteria outlined in 21 CFR  
 20 1301.74(b)."  
 21 Did I read that correctly?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. Okay. And that is the section  
 24 that we've been discussing today, right?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1087

1 Q. Okay. And that's the section  
 2 that governs the reporting of suspicious  
 3 orders?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Okay. Beginning with the next  
 6 sentence, "By way of background, as you know,  
 7 BBDC participated in the development of a  
 8 model excessive purchase report now in use by  
 9 many distributor registrants."  
 10 Were you aware that there was a  
 11 model excessive purchase report that was  
 12 being used by the registrants?  
 13 A. A model? Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. It says, "As used by  
 15 BBDC, the excessive purchase report lists  
 16 total customer purchases for the reported  
 17 month which exceed predetermined multiples of  
 18 the average monthly purchase of BBDC's total  
 19 customer base."  
 20 Did I read that correctly?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Okay. So in describing the  
 23 model excessive purchase report, it refers to  
 24 customer purchases, correct?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1089

1 telephonic reporting of customer orders to  
 2 DEA."  
 3 Now, is it your understanding  
 4 that DEA users did consider the excess  
 5 purchase reports to be a useful law  
 6 enforcement tool?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. Okay. And is it your  
 9 understanding that distributors like Bergen  
 10 Brunswig also placed telephonic report --  
 11 also performed telephonic reporting to the  
 12 DEA for suspicious orders in the '90s?  
 13 A. Yes, that's my understanding.  
 14 Q. Okay. And it goes on to say  
 15 that "in an average year, BBDC logs over  
 16 12,000 telephone calls to DEA field offices  
 17 nationwide to quarterly customer orders of  
 18 controlled substances which it believes could  
 19 fit the suspicious order criteria set forth  
 20 in 1301.74(b)."  
 21 Did I read that correctly?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. And you have no reason to  
 24 dispute the fact stated here that Bergen  
 25 Brunswig was placing 12,000 calls to DEA

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1088

1 Q. And a monthly report, correct?  
 2 A. Correct.  
 3 Q. Okay. And it goes on to say at  
 4 the end of that paragraph, "This report is  
 5 produced in hard copy form monthly and is  
 6 sent via certified mail to each DEA field  
 7 office having responsibility for the  
 8 reporting BBDC locations."  
 9 Did I read that correctly?  
 10 A. Yes, you did.  
 11 Q. And is that your understanding  
 12 of how it worked?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait. Hang  
 15 on. Give me time to object.  
 16 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 18 Scope.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 20 Q. Next paragraph. "While  
 21 feedback from DEA users over the years has  
 22 generally confirmed our belief that the  
 23 report standing alone is a useful law  
 24 enforcement tool, BBDC suspicious order  
 25 compliance program also involves the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1090

1 field offices a year, do you?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 3 Scope.  
 4 THE WITNESS: No, I don't.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 6 Q. Okay. And then it goes on to  
 7 say that "In nearly every instance, the  
 8 telephonic contacts are made to report orders  
 9 which later appeared on the month end  
 10 excessive reports sent to DEA."  
 11 Did I read that correctly?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. Okay. So the orders that were  
 14 being reported to the DEA daily,  
 15 telephonically, were also being included on  
 16 the month-end excessive purchase reports,  
 17 correct?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 19 Scope.  
 20 THE WITNESS: That's what it  
 21 says.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 23 Q. Okay. Was that your  
 24 understanding?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1091

1 THE WITNESS: Based on this,  
 2 yes, that's my understanding.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 4 Q. Okay. Now, next paragraph,  
 5 second sentence, "Some field offices have  
 6 insisted that BBDC not telephonically report  
 7 suspicious orders at all" --  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Where are  
 9 you?  
 10 MR. MAHADY: Bottom of the  
 11 page.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 13 Q. -- "but rather to mail or fax  
 14 copies of the order documents, 222 forms or  
 15 invoices of them instead."  
 16 Did I read that correctly?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Okay. So a DEA field office  
 19 could give guidance to registrants about how  
 20 they wanted suspicious orders reported,  
 21 correct?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 25 Q. Okay. And your --

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1093

1 guidance to registrants about the suspicious  
 2 order reporting requirements, correct?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 6 Q. Okay. And the DEA's  
 7 expectation would be that the registrants  
 8 listened to the guidance they were receiving  
 9 from the field offices, correct?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. Okay. And if a DEA field  
 12 office told to -- advised a registrant to  
 13 report a suspicious order in one form versus  
 14 another, they should listen to that DEA field  
 15 office, correct?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. Okay.  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. Now, the next sentence there,  
 20 it says, "Some offices have diplomatically  
 21 attempted to offer guidance as to the types  
 22 of orders that their offices would deem  
 23 reportable in an effort to limit the number  
 24 of telephone contacts."  
 25 Did I read that correctly?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1092

1 MS. MAINIGI: If I could  
 2 interrupt, why is that scope?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Because the  
 4 authorization letter is explicit that  
 5 he is authorized to testify about  
 6 industrywide guidance but not  
 7 individual communications to specific  
 8 registrants.  
 9 MS. MAINIGI: Okay. Well, I  
 10 think that's industrywide, but thank  
 11 you for that clarification.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Specific  
 13 phone calls to Bergen Brunswig is  
 14 industrywide?  
 15 MS. MAINIGI: I don't think  
 16 that's the scope of the question, but  
 17 I'll -- I apologize for interrupting.  
 18 I just wanted to know the answer.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Do you  
 20 understand my objection?  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yeah.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 24 Q. So just to go back.  
 25 DEA field offices could provide

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1094

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. Are you aware that some DEA  
 3 field offices in the '90s were trying to  
 4 limit the number of suspicious orders being  
 5 reported telephonically by the registrants?  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 7 Exceeds the scope of the Touhy  
 8 authorization.  
 9 You can answer in your personal  
 10 capacity.  
 11 THE WITNESS: I'm not  
 12 personally aware of that.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 14 Q. Okay. But you have no reason  
 15 to dispute the accuracy of that statement?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 17 for speculation.  
 18 You can answer.  
 19 THE WITNESS: I don't.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 21 Q. Okay. I want to go down to the  
 22 middle of the page where it says, "Against  
 23 this backdrop."  
 24 Do you see it?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1095

1 Q. Okay. "Against this backdrop,  
 2 BBDC set to work on the development of a  
 3 suspicious order reporting system that would  
 4 provide better quality information to DEA in  
 5 a more efficient manner."  
 6 Did I read that correctly?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. And you would agree with me  
 9 that that's a laudable goal to have for a  
 10 registrant?  
 11 A. A lot of what?  
 12 Q. That's something that a  
 13 registrant should strive to do, is to provide  
 14 better quality information to the DEA?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Okay. Now, I'm going to read  
 17 the next paragraph, which describes the plan.  
 18 "Our plan involves the creation  
 19 of a computer program that compares a  
 20 customer's controlled substance orders  
 21 expressed in metric units of the active  
 22 ingredient against a standard representing an  
 23 average of the customer's prior four months  
 24 of orders. Customers whose order exceed by a  
 25 specified percentage their prior four-month

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1097

1 for speculation.  
 2 You can answer.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 4 Q. "When DEA offices open each  
 5 day, the summary report would be waiting for  
 6 their review. DEA offices could also elect  
 7 to receive a month-end version of this report  
 8 via US mail. The summary report would show  
 9 the customer name, address, DEA number, item  
 10 description, NDC number, order date, active  
 11 ingredient volume ordered, active ingredient  
 12 shipped and customer allowance, i.e., average  
 13 of customer's prior four-month orders."  
 14 Did I read that correctly?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Now, what's contemplated here  
 17 in the summary report that would be faxed  
 18 daily to the DEA, so the DEA field offices  
 19 would have it in the morning, included active  
 20 ingredient shipped, correct?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 22 for speculation.  
 23 THE WITNESS: It's what it  
 24 says.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1096

1 average order history would be printed on a  
 2 summary report."  
 3 Did I read that correctly?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Okay. "BBDC's mainframe  
 6 computer in Orange, California, would  
 7 automatically fax this report simultaneously  
 8 to each respective DEA field office daily in  
 9 the early a.m. hours after the distribution  
 10 center has completed order processing  
 11 activities."  
 12 Did I read that correctly?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. So what's contemplated  
 15 here is that BBDC would generate a report at  
 16 the end of the night, after it had completed  
 17 its order processing for the day, correct?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 19 Scope. Calls for speculation.  
 20 THE WITNESS: So they pulled --  
 21 so the orders were already pulled and  
 22 already ready to ship?  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 24 Q. Yes. Okay.  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1098

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 2 Q. Okay.  
 3 A. But again, these are all  
 4 after-the-fact shipping.  
 5 Q. Correct.  
 6 So these would be suspicious  
 7 orders that were reported to the DEA after  
 8 they had already been shipped, right?  
 9 A. Right.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait.  
 11 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 13 speculation.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 15 Q. And Bergen Brunswig is seeking  
 16 to implement a program that would do just  
 17 that, report -- I'm sorry, ship and then  
 18 report suspicious orders, right?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 20 for speculation.  
 21 THE WITNESS: But in -- as this  
 22 morning's testimony, in all these  
 23 various communications we have stated  
 24 that a suspicious order is prior to  
 25 shipment.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1099

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 2 Q. Okay.  
 3 A. So you're giving us, again,  
 4 after the fact, which does not -- just  
 5 because you report it doesn't alleviate that  
 6 you maintain effective controls over  
 7 diversion.  
 8 Q. Okay. But Bergen Brunswig is  
 9 specifically saying, "We're going to report  
 10 suspicious orders after they had already been  
 11 shipped," correct?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 13 for speculation.  
 14 You can answer in your personal  
 15 capacity.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 17 Q. That's what they're proposing  
 18 to implement. That's all I'm trying to ask  
 19 you based off of this document.  
 20 A. Right, and --  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: You can  
 22 answer based on your personal  
 23 understanding of what Bergen Brunswig  
 24 is proposing to implement.  
 25 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1101

1 question would be the assigned -- assignment  
 2 of the percentage value that a customer's  
 3 order would have to exceed before that order  
 4 would appear on the report."  
 5 Did I read that correctly?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Okay. And then it goes on to  
 8 say, "Tom, we are excited about the  
 9 opportunity to make constructive changes in  
 10 our suspicious order reporting system. By  
 11 working in a partnership with your office, we  
 12 can perhaps lead the way to developing a new  
 13 system that everyone feels good about."  
 14 Did I read that correctly?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Okay. And as the  
 17 representative from the DEA, was it your  
 18 understanding that Bergen Brunswig in 1996  
 19 was trying to work with the DEA as part of a  
 20 partnership to develop a system that everyone  
 21 could feel good about?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 23 for speculation.  
 24 You, Tom Prevoznik, can answer.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's what

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1100

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1102

1 Q. Okay. And your answer was  
 2 "right," that's your understanding of what  
 3 they're proposing?  
 4 A. That's my understanding of it,  
 5 yes.  
 6 Q. Okay. Next page. "Our intent  
 7 is to receive DEA's permission to replace our  
 8 current manner of daily suspicious order  
 9 reporting with the daily electronic facsimile  
 10 report," correct?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. Okay. "We would like to have  
 13 DEA input on the final product because DEA  
 14 will be the primary users. One suggestion  
 15 would be to coordinate with one of your field  
 16 offices, perhaps the Los Angeles office, to  
 17 meet with our project development team."  
 18 Did I read that correctly?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. Okay. It goes on to  
 21 say, "While your field office could beta test  
 22 the report and provide us with input on  
 23 aesthetics and content, there are some key  
 24 questions that DEA would need to provide  
 25 input on before the report is finalized. One

1 it appears to be.  
 2 (Prevoznik Exhibit 26 marked  
 3 for identification.)  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 5 Q. Okay. I'm going to mark P,  
 6 Prevoznik 24 [sic].  
 7 Okay. And there is a back.  
 8 A. Okay. Thank you.  
 9 Q. Okay. Again, this document has  
 10 a US DEA Bates number; is that correct?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. All right. So this document  
 13 was in the possession, custody and control of  
 14 the United States DEA, correct?  
 15 A. Correct.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And appears  
 17 to be identical to ABDC269353.  
 18 MR. MAHADY: And I did not say  
 19 it wasn't.  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Progress.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 22 Q. This document is dated  
 23 October 29, 1996, right?  
 24 A. It looks like 1996.  
 25 Q. Yeah, the stamp is really not

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1103

1 the best.  
 2 A. Yeah, it's a little hard to  
 3 say, but, yeah, it looks like 1996.  
 4 Q. Okay. And that's just under  
 5 one month after Mr. Zimmerman sent his letter  
 6 describing the proposed program to Thomas  
 7 Gitchel; is that right?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. Okay. And in the first  
 10 paragraph of this letter which is sent to  
 11 Bergen Brunswig from Mr. Gitchel, he said  
 12 that "reference is made to your recent letter  
 13 in which you requested that Bergen Brunswig  
 14 be permitted to replace its current  
 15 telephonic reporting of suspicious orders  
 16 with a daily report transmitted by  
 17 facsimile."  
 18 Did I read that correctly?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. Okay. So the DEA understood  
 21 that Bergen Brunswig was trying to replace  
 22 its daily suspicious order reporting with  
 23 this summary fax, right?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection to  
 25 the characterization.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1105

1 months for ARCOS data to catch up.  
 2 Q. Okay.  
 3 A. To catch up. So...  
 4 Q. But at least Bergen Brunswig  
 5 was saying to the DEA these are suspicious  
 6 orders that we're reporting, correct?  
 7 A. That's what it says, yes.  
 8 Q. Okay. So your expectation  
 9 would be that the DEA would have corrected  
 10 them and said, no, you certainly can't be  
 11 referring to suspicious orders if you're  
 12 referring to after-the-fact sales; is that  
 13 right?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 15 Mischaracterizes. Calls for  
 16 speculation.  
 17 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, can  
 18 you repeat that?  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 20 Q. Bergen Brunswig was developing  
 21 a program to meet with their suspicious order  
 22 reporting requirements, correct?  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 24 Scope. Calls for speculation.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1104

1 THE WITNESS: It looks like --  
 2 yes, so that's what it looks like, but  
 3 it -- because it's a daily report of  
 4 sales that have been commenced, it  
 5 would be the excessive purchase  
 6 reports.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 8 Q. Okay. But they're specifically  
 9 referring to suspicious orders?  
 10 A. I see that's what -- what  
 11 they're saying, but I'm just -- I'm telling  
 12 you that we've already shown and have been  
 13 clear that suspicious orders are prior to  
 14 shipment.  
 15 So you're giving us a -- in  
 16 reading this, you're giving us after-the-fact  
 17 purchase reports, and that was --  
 18 Q. Okay. So would -- I'm sorry.  
 19 A. And that was part -- and we at  
 20 DEA at this time in particular, 1996, where  
 21 ARCOS was at least 9 to 12 months not being  
 22 accurate or being caught up to speed, this  
 23 was -- this was a very good tool for us  
 24 because it was more up-to-date information  
 25 than we would have if we waited the 9 or 12

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1106

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 2 Q. That's what these letters are  
 3 about?  
 4 A. Well, I mean, it started with  
 5 an excessive -- we started with an excessive  
 6 purchase model, and now you jumped to  
 7 suspicious orders, so --  
 8 Q. Right.  
 9 So there was a reference in the  
 10 last document to excessive purchase reports?  
 11 A. Right, which are -- which are  
 12 after the fact.  
 13 Q. After the fact.  
 14 A. Right.  
 15 Q. And this new fax system is to  
 16 replace the daily phone calls.  
 17 Are we on the same page?  
 18 A. Right.  
 19 Q. Okay. And the daily phone  
 20 calls were to report suspicious orders,  
 21 correct?  
 22 A. Okay.  
 23 Q. Okay. And these faxes are to  
 24 report suspicious orders as well, as  
 25 represented by Bergen Brunswig?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1107

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 2 Foundation.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Well, it's a  
 4 little confusing because you're saying  
 5 that you're going to pull the orders  
 6 and then you're going to fax the  
 7 summaries to us after the fact.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 9 Q. Well, let's look at the DEA's  
 10 response.  
 11 A. Right?  
 12 Q. Let's look at the DEA's  
 13 response. This is from the DEA. "Reference  
 14 is made to your recent letter in which you  
 15 requested that Bergen Brunswig be permitted  
 16 to replace its current telephonic reporting  
 17 of suspicious orders with a daily report  
 18 transmitted by facsimile."  
 19 Okay? So the DEA is saying  
 20 your request is to report your daily  
 21 suspicious order reporting, correct?  
 22 A. Correct.  
 23 Q. Okay. The DEA goes on to say,  
 24 "We have reviewed your proposal and feel that  
 25 it could be a viable alternative to the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1109

1 A. So it wouldn't be a suspicious  
 2 order. It would be an excessive purchase.  
 3 Q. Okay. Let's keep reading.  
 4 A. It's an after-the-fact  
 5 purchase.  
 6 Q. "As proposed, the summary  
 7 report would include the customer's name,  
 8 address and DEA number, a description of the  
 9 item ordered, the NDC number, date ordered,  
 10 active ingredient volume ordered and shipped,  
 11 and the customer's allowance on average -- or  
 12 average order."  
 13 Did I read that correctly?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. Okay. And what the DEA is  
 16 saying is that we understand that you want to  
 17 replace your daily suspicious order reporting  
 18 with a summary fax that would include, among  
 19 other information, the amount of product that  
 20 was shipped.  
 21 A. Right. So they're reporting  
 22 excessive -- they're doing an excess purchase  
 23 report, is what they're doing.  
 24 Q. Okay. Now, do you see anywhere  
 25 in the first two paragraphs where the DEA

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1108

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1110

1 current system. It is our understanding that  
 2 a computer program has been created that can  
 3 compare a customer's controlled substances  
 4 orders to an average of the customer's order  
 5 for the prior four months. Customer orders  
 6 that exceed their four-month average order  
 7 history by an as-yet unspecified percentage  
 8 would be shown on a summary report that would  
 9 be sent to the appropriate DEA field office  
 10 on a daily basis."  
 11 Did I read that correctly?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. Okay. And they are talking  
 14 here about suspicious orders, correct?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 16 Scope. Mischaracterizes.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Well, no. If you  
 18 keep going, it gets down to a reading  
 19 of both ordered and shipped. So  
 20 they're indicating it's after the  
 21 fact.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 23 Q. Right.  
 24  
 25

1 clarifies that what you are proposing Bergen  
 2 Brunswig is an excessive purchase reporting  
 3 system, not a suspicious order reporting  
 4 system?  
 5 A. No, I don't.  
 6 Q. Okay. They -- the DEA says  
 7 suspicious order, right?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 9 Mischaracterizes the document.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 11 Q. The first sentence.  
 12 A. Yes, it's reference to your  
 13 letter.  
 14 Q. Suspicious order?  
 15 A. Yeah.  
 16 Q. Okay. Now, these excessive  
 17 purchase reports, just because we've talked  
 18 about them in the last document, you just  
 19 brought them up, the DEA understood that  
 20 these were also suspicious order reports,  
 21 right?  
 22 A. No, because they were after the  
 23 fact.  
 24 Q. Okay. So the DEA did not  
 25 understand that the monthly reports were

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1111

1 suspicious order reports?  
 2 A. Well, I can just tell you  
 3 what D -- DEA policy has been not to approve  
 4 a system. It has also been that a suspicious  
 5 order is prior to shipment.  
 6 Q. Is it possible that the DEA  
 7 deviated from their policy?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 9 Calls for speculation.  
 10 THE WITNESS: I can just tell  
 11 you what the policy is of DEA.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 13 Q. I appreciate that.  
 14 Is it possible that they  
 15 deviated from their policy?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 17 speculation.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Anything is  
 19 possible.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 21 Q. Okay. And it's possible that  
 22 they deviated from their policy in approving  
 23 for implementation nationwide a suspicious  
 24 order monitoring system that reported  
 25 suspicious orders after the order had already

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1113

1 monthly suspicious order report, the new  
 2 program will compare the customer's order to  
 3 his or her previous orders rather than to  
 4 orders placed by other customers."  
 5 Did I read that correctly?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Now, the DEA is the one  
 8 referring to the monthly report as a  
 9 suspicious order report, correct?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. Okay. So at least some  
 12 individuals at the DEA understood the monthly  
 13 report of after-the-fact sales to be  
 14 suspicious order reports, based off of this  
 15 document?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 17 speculation.  
 18 THE WITNESS: I don't know. I  
 19 mean, it -- I think at this time  
 20 excessive purchase and suspicious  
 21 orders were sometimes understood as  
 22 one or the other, but clearly a  
 23 suspicious order that we have been  
 24 clear on, the suspicious order was not  
 25 to be -- was prior to shipment.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1112

1 been shipped?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 3 speculation.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Can you please  
 5 repeat it?  
 6 MR. MAHADY: Can you read that  
 7 back? Because I probably can't do it  
 8 as well the second time.  
 9 (Court Reporter read back  
 10 question.)  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 12 speculation and mischaracterizes the  
 13 document.  
 14 You can answer.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't  
 16 know.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 18 Q. It's possible?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 20 speculation.  
 21 THE WITNESS: It's possible.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 23 Q. Okay. Now, the next -- the  
 24 third paragraph. "We note that unlike the  
 25 program that generates Bergen Brunswig's

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1114

1 So summary reports, if -- any  
 2 summary report that showed sales that  
 3 were commenced and done were  
 4 considered excessive purchase orders.  
 5 They were not suspicious orders,  
 6 because suspicious orders would be  
 7 before the shipment.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 9 Q. That's not in the regulation,  
 10 correct?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 12 Argumentative. Mischaracterizes the  
 13 regulation.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 15 Q. Does the regulation say that a  
 16 suspicious order needs to be reported prior  
 17 to shipment?  
 18 A. It says immediately upon  
 19 discovery.  
 20 Q. Okay.  
 21 A. And the statute says you  
 22 have -- that each registrant is to maintain  
 23 effective controls of that.  
 24 Q. I appreciate that.  
 25 But very specifically, does

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1115

1 the registrant -- does the statute or the  
 2 implementing regulations say that a  
 3 suspicious order must be reported prior to  
 4 shipment?  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 6 answered.  
 7 MR. MAHADY: I don't believe he  
 8 answered the question, that specific  
 9 question.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I believe he  
 11 did.  
 12 You can answer again.  
 13 THE WITNESS: I thought I did,  
 14 too.  
 15 The statute requires to have  
 16 effective control to guard against  
 17 diversion.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 19 Q. I appreciate that.  
 20 A. So if you have a suspicious  
 21 order, which is prior to shipping, you have a  
 22 reason or reason to believe that that -- that  
 23 is going to be diverted into the illicit  
 24 market, right? So your system is designed to  
 25 give -- to find that reason or reasons why

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1117

1 A. Sure.  
 2 Q. -- and I'm just talking about  
 3 the text of the regulations. Okay?  
 4 Does the text of the  
 5 regulations contain anything that explicitly  
 6 says that a suspicious order must be reported  
 7 to the DEA prior to shipment?  
 8 A. No, it says immediately upon  
 9 discovery.  
 10 Q. Okay. Now --  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Counsel, I'm  
 12 going to ask for a break in five  
 13 minutes.  
 14 MR. MAHADY: Sure.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 16 Q. Tom Gitchel, okay, he's the one  
 17 that wrote this letter, right?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. And at least to Tom Gitchel,  
 20 Bergen Brunswig's monthly report was a  
 21 suspicious order report?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 23 speculation. Scope.  
 24 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what  
 25 Tom -- yeah.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1116

1 this shipment -- or why this order is to be  
 2 suspicious. That is prior to shipping.  
 3 Q. Okay.  
 4 A. So in order to maintain  
 5 effective controls, you would then have to  
 6 look at the suspicion. What triggered the  
 7 suspicion -- we're in Bergen Brunswig. Let's  
 8 go with Bergen. What triggered Bergen to  
 9 say, "Wait a minute, something's not right  
 10 with this order."  
 11 Q. Okay.  
 12 A. So then they should halt and  
 13 try to figure out, what can we alleviate  
 14 that.  
 15 Q. Okay.  
 16 A. What can we alleviate to that  
 17 suspicion.  
 18 So if you're just giving us  
 19 summary reports at the end where we've  
 20 already shipped it and say, "these are all  
 21 suspicious orders," well, what did you -- how  
 22 did you maintain any effective controls?  
 23 That would be my question.  
 24 Q. Okay. I have a very specific  
 25 question --

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1118

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 2 Q. But Tom refers to it as a  
 3 monthly suspicious order report, correct?  
 4 A. Right.  
 5 Q. All right. And at least to Tom  
 6 Gitchel, his understanding of what was being  
 7 proposed is a daily fax of suspicious orders  
 8 that would include, among other information,  
 9 the amount that was shipped, correct?  
 10 A. Correct.  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 12 for speculation.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 14 Q. Now, if you can turn to the  
 15 next page, last paragraph, "We look forward  
 16 to working with you on this new project which  
 17 we, too, hope will lead to a more efficient  
 18 suspicious order reporting system."  
 19 Did I read that correctly?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. Now, they clearly were  
 22 developing a suspicious order reporting  
 23 system, right?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 25 Vague. Scope. Calls for speculation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1119

1 THE WITNESS: Again, I can only  
 2 reiterate what the DEA policy is.  
 3 Suspicious orders are prior to  
 4 shipment.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 6 Q. But you're here on behalf of  
 7 the DEA and registrant that was provided --  
 8 or guidance that was provided to registrants.  
 9 Tom Gitchel was the chief  
 10 liaison -- the chief of the liaison and  
 11 policy section, right?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. He's not some low-level DEA  
 14 employee, right?  
 15 A. No.  
 16 Q. He's pretty high up?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Okay. And his section was the  
 19 one that was responsible for interpreting the  
 20 regulations, correct?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 22 Scope. Foundation.  
 23 You can answer.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1121

1 MR. MAHADY: Okay. We can take  
 2 a break.  
 3 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off  
 4 record. The time is 2:32.  
 5 (Off the record at 2:32 p.m.)  
 6 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back  
 7 on record. Beginning of Media File  
 8 Number 7. The time is 2:45.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 10 Q. All right. Mr. Prevoznik,  
 11 sticking with Exhibit Prevoznik 24 for just  
 12 one more question or two.  
 13 Turning back to the first page  
 14 of that document from Mr. Gitchel to  
 15 Mr. Zimmerman at Bergen Brunswig, it says  
 16 that -- Mr. Gitchel said, "We agree that it  
 17 would be prudent to test this new program  
 18 before instituting it nationwide and concur  
 19 with your suggestion to use the DEA Los  
 20 Angeles division office for the beta test."  
 21 Did I read that correct?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. All right. And it says, "We  
 24 would appreciate it if you could postpone  
 25 starting the testing until after February 1,

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1120

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1122

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 2 Q. And at least to Tom Gitchel,  
 3 the monthly reports, the monthly excessive  
 4 purchase reports, were suspicious order  
 5 reports, correct?  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 7 Scope. Calls for speculation. Asked  
 8 and answered.  
 9 THE WITNESS: We've also read  
 10 letters --  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 12 Q. Mr. Prevoznik --  
 13 A. I'm just telling you that  
 14 Mr. Gitchel also wrote letters that we went  
 15 through this morning that also said what I  
 16 had said the DEA's policy is.  
 17 Q. Okay.  
 18 A. It's after the shipment --  
 19 suspicious orders prior to shipment.  
 20 Q. So was Mr. Gitchel giving  
 21 inconsistent guidance to the registrants, in  
 22 your opinion?  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 24 You can give your opinion.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Slightly, yes.

1 1997, as Ms. Betsy Willis, who has been  
 2 selected for the diversion program manager  
 3 position in the Los Angeles field division,  
 4 will not be reporting for duty until the end  
 5 of January."  
 6 Did I read that correctly?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. All right. And in preparing  
 9 for your deposition today, did you have the  
 10 opportunity to speak with Ms. Betsy Willis?  
 11 A. No, I did not.  
 12 Q. I would like to mark Prevoznik  
 13 25.  
 14 (Prevoznik Exhibit 25 marked  
 15 for identification.)  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 17 Q. For the record, while the  
 18 witness has an opportunity to read the  
 19 document, the Bates number is  
 20 ABDCMDL00269350.  
 21 It's a letter from Chris  
 22 Zimmerman to Thomas Gitchel, chief liaison  
 23 and policy section, US DEA, December 30,  
 24 1997.  
 25 A. Okay.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1123

1 Q. Okay. Let's start with the  
 2 first paragraph of the letter from  
 3 Mr. Zimmerman to Mr. Gitchel.  
 4 "This letter serves as a follow  
 5 up to previous written correspondence, copy  
 6 enclosed, and telephone conversations  
 7 between -- Bergen Brunswig Drug Company has  
 8 had with the DEA pertaining to BBDC's newly  
 9 developed system to monitor and report  
 10 customer orders of controlled substances  
 11 which fit the suspicious order criteria  
 12 outlined in 21 CFR 1301.74(b)."  
 13 Did I read that correctly?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. Okay. So this correspondence  
 16 relates to Bergen Brunswig's development of a  
 17 new suspicious order monitoring system to  
 18 meet the requirements of 21 CFR 1301.74(b),  
 19 correct?  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 23 Q. Okay. Next paragraph. "The  
 24 system is clearly described in the enclosed  
 25 September 30, 1996 correspondence. Per your

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1125

1 A. I don't believe so.  
 2 Q. Okay. And what about anyone  
 3 who was at the Tampa DEA office in June  
 4 of 1997?  
 5 A. I'm trying to remember where  
 6 everybody was. I'm not sure.  
 7 Q. Okay. Did you speak with  
 8 anyone who was involved -- anyone at the DEA  
 9 who was involved in the development and  
 10 testing of the Bergen Brunswig suspicious  
 11 order monitoring system in 1990 -- between  
 12 1996 and 1998, to your knowledge?  
 13 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 14 Q. Okay. The next paragraph. "We  
 15 have had several conversations/meetings with  
 16 Ms. Betsy Willis, DEA diversion program  
 17 manager; Ms. Valencia Abrams, DEA Los Angeles  
 18 division group supervisor; Mr. Thomas Cox,  
 19 DEA Riverside diversion group supervisor; and  
 20 Mr. Arthur Fierman-Rentas, DEA Tampa  
 21 diversion group supervisor. All DEA  
 22 personnel currently involved with the beta  
 23 test program have been very pleased, and  
 24 Ms. Willis has given BBDC permission to  
 25 discontinue the submission of monthly ARCOS

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1124

1 instruction, BBDC began beta testing the new  
 2 suspicious order reporting system with the  
 3 DEA Los Angeles field office in March 1997.  
 4 Our BBDC Valencia division began the new  
 5 suspicious order reporting to the LA DEA  
 6 office in March 1, 1997; BBDC Corona division  
 7 began the new reporting to the Riverside DEA  
 8 office on April 1, 1997; and BBDC Hawaii  
 9 began this new reporting to the LA DEA office  
 10 on May 1, 1997; and BBDC Orlando began the  
 11 new reporting to the Tampa DEA office on  
 12 June 1, 1997. All BBDC test divisions are  
 13 currently reporting suspicious orders to DEA  
 14 via the automated fax function of the new  
 15 reporting system."  
 16 Did I read that correctly?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Okay. And in preparing for  
 19 your testimony today, did you speak with  
 20 anyone who was at the Los Angeles field  
 21 office in 1997?  
 22 A. No.  
 23 Q. In preparing for your testimony  
 24 today, did you speak with anyone who was at  
 25 the Riverside DEA office on April 1, 1997?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1126

1 suspicious order report, parens, variance  
 2 report, to DEA for the BBDC Corona, Valencia  
 3 and Hawaii divisions. Correspondence  
 4 enclosed."  
 5 Sitting here today, you have no  
 6 reason to dispute that all the individuals  
 7 involved with the testing were very pleased  
 8 with the suspicious order monitoring program  
 9 being developed?  
 10 A. I have no idea.  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait. Scope.  
 12 Calls for speculation.  
 13 You can answer in your personal  
 14 capacity.  
 15 THE WITNESS: I have no idea.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 17 Q. It goes on to say at the end of  
 18 the page, "BBDC has approached other DEA  
 19 field offices regarding the implementation  
 20 and beta testing of our new suspicious order  
 21 reporting system. However, those DEA field  
 22 offices have indicated that they would not  
 23 implement the new reporting system until they  
 24 received direction from Washington, DC."  
 25 Did I read that correctly?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1127

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. Top of the next page. "BBDC  
 3 has already made several changes to our  
 4 proposed new reporting system at the  
 5 direction of the DEA field offices in whose  
 6 jurisdiction it is being tested. It has been  
 7 an extremely positive experience working  
 8 closely with DEA to develop a suspicious  
 9 order reporting system that benefits both the  
 10 wholesaler and the DEA."

11 Did I read that correctly?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. Based off of this  
 14 document, Bergen Brunswig Drug Corporation  
 15 developed this suspicious order reporting  
 16 system in '96 to '98 with the DEA?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 18 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 19 THE WITNESS: From the various  
 20 letters that you've given me, Bergen  
 21 Brunswig came with a system that they  
 22 wanted to show us, asked us for our  
 23 input. So they showed us the design  
 24 of what they were -- the design of the  
 25 system that they were proposing to put

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1129

1 designing it, Bergen Brunswig came to  
 2 us. So this is between Bergen and us.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 4 Q. Between Bergen and the DEA?  
 5 A. DEA, right.  
 6 Q. Okay. And in designing it, the  
 7 DEA provided input on the design, correct?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait, scope.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Sorry.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 12 Q. And the DEA tested the program,  
 13 correct?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 17 Q. And the DEA, based off of this  
 18 document, was very pleased with how the  
 19 suspicious order monitoring program was being  
 20 run, correct?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 22 for speculation.  
 23 THE WITNESS: That's what it  
 24 appears from the letter.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1128

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1130

1 nationwide.  
 2 So we provided input. We  
 3 tested it with them. So, yes.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 5 Q. Okay. So, yes, the DEA  
 6 developed the program -- the design of the  
 7 program with Bergen Brunswig, correct?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 9 answered. Scope. Foundation.  
 10 You can answer.  
 11 THE WITNESS: We did not design  
 12 it. It said -- I mean, if we go back  
 13 to the September letter, it says it's  
 14 to introduce the DEA to the innovative  
 15 new system under development by Bergen  
 16 Brunswig.  
 17 So Bergen Brunswig, as of  
 18 September 30th, was the one that says,  
 19 "Hey, we have this new system." So  
 20 they came to us and said, "Hey, could  
 21 you review it, help us with it," which  
 22 is exactly what we do with  
 23 registrants. We do do that. We  
 24 listen. We present -- the registrant  
 25 is to design it; not us. So in

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 2 Q. Okay. Next paragraph. "We are  
 3 confident that this new suspicious order  
 4 reporting system will benefit both BBDC and  
 5 DEA and are optimistic that we will be able  
 6 to begin implementation of the new suspicious  
 7 order -- or suspicious reporting system  
 8 nationwide. I believe that the new system  
 9 will not only save both BBDC and DEA valuable  
 10 time and resources, but will also provide DEA  
 11 with a more useful tool with which to detect  
 12 diversion."  
 13 Did I read that correctly?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. Okay. "BBDC is excited about  
 16 this opportunity and would like to continue  
 17 moving forward with the implementation of our  
 18 new suspicious order reporting system."  
 19 Did I read that correctly?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. So there's no dispute here that  
 22 this is -- this relates to the development of  
 23 a suspicious order reporting system, correct?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, it

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1131

1 references back to the September 30 --  
 2 September 30, 1996, where they explain  
 3 what it is, which we just talked  
 4 about, excessive purchase  
 5 after-the-fact reporting.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 7 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, they were  
 8 developing a suspicious order reporting  
 9 system, correct?  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 11 Argumentative. Asked and answered.  
 12 Scope. Calls for speculation.  
 13 You can answer.  
 14 MR. FARRELL: Objection, again,  
 15 on behalf of plaintiffs. We've never  
 16 even seen this system that they're  
 17 talking about.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 19 repeat it?  
 20 MR. MAHADY: Just note for the  
 21 record that plaintiffs have had this  
 22 document for approximately ten months.  
 23 MR. FARRELL: The ABDC system,  
 24 suspicious order monitoring system,  
 25 from 1996?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1133

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 2 Foundation. Calls for speculation.  
 3 That one mischaracterizes prior  
 4 testimony. Asked and answered.  
 5 You can answer again.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Can you -- can  
 7 you --  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 9 Q. Bergen Brunswig and the DEA  
 10 were developing a suspicious order monitoring  
 11 system, correct?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 13 Mischaracterizes prior testimony.  
 14 Scope.  
 15 MR. MAHADY: It was a question.  
 16 It wasn't even about his prior  
 17 testimony. I'm just asking a  
 18 question.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Bergen Brunswig  
 20 was designing a system, and they asked  
 21 us to review it and test it with them.  
 22 That's what we did.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 24 Q. And the system they were  
 25 designing was a suspicious order monitoring

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1132

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1134

1 MR. MAHADY: You've had these  
 2 documents for ten months, Paul.  
 3 MR. FARRELL: Yeah. My  
 4 understanding is the last version of  
 5 the suspicious order monitoring system  
 6 produced by ABDC is when?  
 7 Excuse me. My point is that --  
 8 MR. NICHOLAS: He doesn't have  
 9 to answer your questions.  
 10 MR. MAHADY: Paul, I don't have  
 11 to answer your questions.  
 12 MR. NICHOLAS: You're running  
 13 the clock. Okay. Let him ask his  
 14 questions. You don't have to smirk  
 15 about it either. It's not that funny.  
 16 Go ahead.  
 17 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, can  
 18 you please repeat it?  
 19 MR. MAHADY: Neither of us  
 20 remember it, so I'll take a shot.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 22 Q. The DEA and Bergen Brunswig  
 23 were developing a suspicious order monitoring  
 24 system that Bergen Brunswig intended to meet  
 25 the requirements of the regulations, correct?

1 system, correct?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 3 answered. Calls for speculation.  
 4 You can answer again.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Based on the  
 6 regulations and the statute to  
 7 maintain effective controls, the  
 8 September 30th letter talks about  
 9 after-the-fact shipping. So it  
 10 doesn't -- it's not in accordance with  
 11 DEA policy as being -- suspicious  
 12 orders are prior to shipping.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 14 Q. Okay. And the DEA --  
 15 A. So the September 30th is  
 16 specifically talking about shipping. So it's  
 17 been shipped. That's what it -- that's what  
 18 the September 30th letter you gave me  
 19 indicates, that it's been shipped.  
 20 Q. Now, we've seen at least two  
 21 responses from DEA about the program.  
 22 They're approving a suspicious order  
 23 monitoring system, right?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 25 Argumentative. Asked and answered.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1135

1 You can answer.  
 2 THE WITNESS: They're approving  
 3 the system -- they're approving the  
 4 implementation of the system that  
 5 Bergen Brunswig designed. That's what  
 6 they're approving.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 8 Q. Okay. We can go back to  
 9 Prevoznik 22, please.  
 10 A. 22.  
 11 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, we've already  
 12 looked at this document, but now that we've  
 13 reviewed what the program consisted of, I  
 14 just want to ask a couple follow-up  
 15 questions.  
 16 First sentence of this document  
 17 from Patricia Good, chief liaison and policy  
 18 section, states, "This is to grant approval  
 19 of your request to implement on a nationwide  
 20 basis your newly developed system to identify  
 21 and report suspicious orders for controlled  
 22 substances and regulated chemicals as  
 23 required by federal regulation."  
 24 Correct?  
 25 A. Correct, that's what it says.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1137

1 guidance in 1984 versus the guidance that he  
 2 was providing in relation to the more recent  
 3 development of the Bergen Brunswig suspicious  
 4 order monitoring system, correct?  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 6 Scope.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Can you give it  
 8 to me one more time?  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 10 Q. The inconsistency that  
 11 Mr. Gitchel was providing to the registrants,  
 12 one was in 1984 where, based off of your  
 13 testimony, Mr. Gitchel was advising  
 14 registrants that they should not ship orders  
 15 that they reported as suspicious, correct?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 17 Foundation. Mischaracterizes the  
 18 document.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 21 Q. Versus 1996 or '7 where  
 22 Mr. Gitchel, who was then the chief of the  
 23 liaison policy section of the DEA, is  
 24 referring to a monthly report of  
 25 after-the-fact purchases as a suspicious

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1136

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1138

1 Q. And the subject of this  
 2 document that was drafted by the DEA, within  
 3 the possession, custody and control of the  
 4 DEA and produced in [sic] the DEA in this  
 5 litigation, is "approved suspicious order  
 6 monitoring system"; is that correct?  
 7 A. Yes, that's what it says.  
 8 Q. Okay. Mr. Prevoznik, before  
 9 the break I think we established that  
 10 Mr. Gitchel, who at one time served as the  
 11 chief of the liaison and policy section, was  
 12 inconsistent in the guidance he reported to  
 13 registrants relating to the suspicious order  
 14 regulations, correct?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 16 Foundation.  
 17 THE WITNESS: That was --  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait. Scope.  
 19 You can answer in your personal  
 20 capacity.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I answered  
 22 in my personal capacity. I said yes.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 24 Q. Okay. And I believe what we  
 25 were comparing there was Mr. Gitchel's

1 order report and also advising on a  
 2 suspicious order monitoring system that would  
 3 entail after-the-fact reporting, right?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to the  
 5 form.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Make sure I got  
 7 this right.  
 8 The design is by the  
 9 registrant. Then we get into the  
 10 operate -- the operation of it by the  
 11 registrant.  
 12 So the inconsistency -- which  
 13 I'm talking of me answering this  
 14 question -- is that the -- it just  
 15 seems a little convoluted, from me  
 16 reading this, that the excessive  
 17 purchase and the suspicious orders  
 18 were being referred to as the same  
 19 thing when indeed they are not.  
 20 Because the reg -- because the  
 21 statute and regulations of then DEA  
 22 policy, regulations haven't changed  
 23 since they came into effect. The  
 24 statute hasn't changed.  
 25 So we have been consistent

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1139

1 with -- DEA's consistency has been  
 2 that, where I think the  
 3 inconsistency -- this is me  
 4 speaking -- is that those two words  
 5 have been interchanged. Because it's  
 6 still referring to after-the-fact  
 7 shipments, and suspicious orders are  
 8 before shipment.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 10 Q. Okay. Mr. Prevoznik, the DEA  
 11 approved for implementation nationwide a  
 12 suspicious order monitoring system that  
 13 reported suspicious orders to the DEA on a  
 14 daily basis after the report -- after the  
 15 orders had already been shipped, correct?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, are you aware  
 18 that Bergen Brunswig merged with Amerisource  
 19 in or around 2001 to become AmerisourceBergen  
 20 Corporation?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 22 Scope.  
 23 THE WITNESS: I know they  
 24 merged. I don't know what year.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1141

1 MR. MAHADY: I do. And I'll  
 2 use my short arms to get you one.  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Thank you.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 5 Q. Okay. I'm going to read this  
 6 letter, which is dated January 14, 2004,  
 7 Bates number ABDC MDL 00315827. And it's  
 8 from a John R. McCarty, special agent in  
 9 charge, to Mr. Mays, manager of regulatory  
 10 affairs, AmerisourceBergen.  
 11 I want to read the first  
 12 paragraph of this letter.  
 13 "This letter is to confirm  
 14 previous arrangements made by the Drug  
 15 Enforcement Administration, DEA, office of  
 16 training class coordinator, Thomas Prevoznik,  
 17 for a tour of the Bergen Brunswig facility in  
 18 Richmond, Virginia, by our diversion  
 19 investigator trainees. I appreciate your  
 20 cooperation, and I'm certain that the visit  
 21 to your distribution plant will be a valuable  
 22 learning experience for our students."  
 23 Okay. So I believe you already  
 24 testified that you do recall some trainings  
 25 that were provided by AmerisourceBergen at

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1140

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 2 Q. That's fair.  
 3 And what was your role at the  
 4 DEA in the early 2000s?  
 5 A. 2001 I was -- I got promoted to  
 6 instructor at DEA officer training.  
 7 Q. Okay. And in your role as --  
 8 at the office of training, you were  
 9 personally familiar with AmerisourceBergen,  
 10 Bergen Brunswig's, system, correct?  
 11 A. What do you mean?  
 12 Q. Do you recall taking the  
 13 training classes to the Bergen Brunswig,  
 14 AmerisourceBergen distribution centers in  
 15 Richmond, Virginia?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 (Prevoznik Exhibit 27 marked  
 18 for identification.)  
 19 MR. MAHADY: Okay. I'm going  
 20 to mark this next document as  
 21 Prevoznik 27.  
 22 Unfortunately, I have short  
 23 arms, Mr. Prevoznik, so...  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: The important  
 25 thing is, do you have extra copies?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1142

1 its distribution center in Virginia to the  
 2 diversion investigator trainees, correct?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. Okay. And do you recall those  
 5 trainings involved discussions about the  
 6 applicable rules and regulation that govern  
 7 distributors?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. Okay. And by bringing your  
 10 diversion investigator trainees to  
 11 AmerisourceBergen, you obviously thought that  
 12 there was value in AmerisourceBergen advising  
 13 them of what their understanding of the  
 14 regulations were, correct?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 16 Scope.  
 17 You can answer.  
 18 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, can  
 19 you repeat the -- repeat the question?  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 21 Q. Well, by bringing your  
 22 diversion investigator trainees to  
 23 AmerisourceBergen and having  
 24 AmerisourceBergen present on the DEA's rules  
 25 and regulations, you certainly thought that

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1143

1 AmerisourceBergen was complying with those  
 2 rules and regulations, right?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 4 Scope. Mischaracterizes the document.  
 5 THE WITNESS: I mean, the goal  
 6 wasn't for them to -- the goal was to  
 7 expose them to a real registrant. So  
 8 give them -- they had -- we go through  
 9 security, we go through records,  
 10 reports, all of those kinds of things  
 11 while we're at training.  
 12 We don't have huge cages. We  
 13 don't have a bunch of cameras. We  
 14 don't have any of the practical things  
 15 that the registrant has, especially  
 16 Bergen Brunswig. At this time at this  
 17 distribution center they had cages,  
 18 the locks, the alarms, that kind of  
 19 thing.  
 20 So that was -- that was to get  
 21 them out to expose them to that type  
 22 of a real practical application.

23 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:

24 Q. Understood.

25 A. Right?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1145

1 exhibit Prevoznik 28. Provide a copy to the  
 2 government.  
 3 You're free to look at the  
 4 presentation, but I'm only going to ask you  
 5 questions about the cover document.  
 6 A. Okay.  
 7 Q. Let me know when you're ready.  
 8 The document is Bates-labeled ABDC MDL  
 9 00315829.  
 10 Ready?  
 11 A. Yeah.  
 12 Q. This is an internal  
 13 AmerisourceBergen memorandum dated  
 14 October 25, 2004. Subject, ABC awarded DEA  
 15 certificate of appreciation.  
 16 I'm going to read the document.  
 17 "As many of you already know,  
 18 CSRA regularly provides training for  
 19 diversion investigator trainees from DEA's  
 20 Quantico, Virginia training academy. This  
 21 training takes place at AmerisourceBergen's  
 22 Richmond distribution center and includes a  
 23 tour of the facility.  
 24 "At the conclusion of the  
 25 training on Friday, October 22, 2004, DEA

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1144

1 So part of it was they also --  
 2 I believe Steve actually gave the  
 3 presentation. And he talked about the  
 4 interaction with DEA, because that's what we  
 5 were trying -- these were all new trainees,  
 6 so they had never been exposed to any of  
 7 this.  
 8 So we thought this was a great  
 9 opportunity for that --  
 10 Q. Okay.  
 11 A. -- collaboration.  
 12 Q. And that was valuable -- that  
 13 was, in fact, a valuable experience for your  
 14 diversion investigator trainees?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 18 Q. Okay. And AmerisourceBergen  
 19 partnered with you to provide that training,  
 20 right?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 (Prevoznik Exhibit 28 marked  
 23 for identification.)  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 25 Q. Okay. I'm going to mark

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1146

1 presented AmerisourceBergen Corporation with  
 2 a certificate of appreciation in recognition  
 3 of ABC's contributions to drug enforcement  
 4 and to DEA's training program. Steve Mays  
 5 accepted the award on behalf of  
 6 AmerisourceBergen."  
 7 Do you recall DEA awarded  
 8 AmerisourceBergen a certificate of  
 9 appreciation in 2004?  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 13 Q. Okay. And they were deserving  
 14 of that recognition?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 18 Q. You can put that document  
 19 aside, Mr. Prevoznik.  
 20 Now, fortunately for you, I do  
 21 want to revisit P22, which is the DEA  
 22 memorandum summarizing the distributor  
 23 initiative conference presentation with  
 24 AmerisourceBergen.  
 25 A. Thank you.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1147

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: This is  
 2 Prevoznik 22 or Plaintiff's 22?  
 3 MR. MAHADY: Plaintiff's 22.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Plaintiff's  
 5 22. Give me a second.  
 6 THE WITNESS: It's way at the  
 7 bottom.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 9 Q. I know you already looked at  
 10 this this morning.  
 11 Are you okay for me to proceed  
 12 asking questions?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. All right. Again, internal  
 15 memorandum of the DEA. This document  
 16 summarizes the DEA's understanding or summary  
 17 of the meeting, correct?  
 18 A. Correct.  
 19 Q. Okay. You do not attend these  
 20 meetings?  
 21 A. No.  
 22 Q. Okay. And just, again, so the  
 23 record's clear, it's from Michael Mapes.  
 24 You did not speak with Michael  
 25 Mapes in preparation for your testimony

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1149

1 Q. Got it.  
 2 And based off of the DEA's  
 3 summary of the meeting, it says, "In  
 4 consultation with Mr. Trant, it was agreed  
 5 that if E-Commerce Operations, ODCO, were to  
 6 identify a highly suspicious pharmacy to  
 7 which AmerisourceBergen was the wholesaler,  
 8 ODCO would notify AmerisourceBergen via  
 9 e-mail of the suspicious activity for  
 10 AmerisourceBergen to review and take the  
 11 actions the company deems appropriate."  
 12 Did I read that correctly?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. So at this meeting, the  
 15 DEA represented to Mr. Steve Mays of  
 16 AmerisourceBergen that if the DEA identified  
 17 a highly suspicious pharmacy to which  
 18 AmerisourceBergen was the wholesaler, it  
 19 would notify AmerisourceBergen via e-mail of  
 20 that pharmacy, correct?  
 21 A. That's what it says.  
 22 Q. Okay. As the representative of  
 23 the DEA, do you know if the DEA identified  
 24 highly suspicious pharmacies to  
 25 AmerisourceBergen?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1148

1 today?  
 2 A. No.  
 3 Q. Okay. The last sentence of the  
 4 first paragraph, it says, "The purpose of the  
 5 meeting was to address the illegal domestic  
 6 Internet pharmacy problem and their source of  
 7 supply."  
 8 Did I read that correctly?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. And that's your understanding  
 11 of the purpose of the meeting?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. Okay. If we turn to the next  
 14 page, I want to start -- I want to read the  
 15 sentence -- the paragraph that starts, "In  
 16 consultation with Mr. Trant."  
 17 Do you know who Mr. Trant is?  
 18 A. He was an attorney with our  
 19 Chief Counsel.  
 20 Q. Okay. So he's DEA?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. Okay. And E-Commerce  
 23 Operations, ODCO, that's DEA as well, right?  
 24 A. Yes, that was Mr. Mapes'  
 25 section.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1150

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm going to  
 2 object and instruct you not to answer.  
 3 We had a separate witness for  
 4 this topic. AmerisourceBergen had the  
 5 opportunity to ask questions then and  
 6 they didn't. This witness has not  
 7 been designated to answer questions  
 8 about this topic.  
 9 MR. MAHADY: This witness has  
 10 already testified in response to  
 11 questions from plaintiffs about the  
 12 substance of these meetings. These  
 13 questions are based directly on what  
 14 was represented by the DEA at the  
 15 meeting.  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: So he can  
 17 definitely talk about the distributor  
 18 initiative briefing, including the one  
 19 to AmerisourceBergen. But if the  
 20 question is DEA's practice of  
 21 notifying registrants when a different  
 22 registrant suspended orders to a  
 23 particular suspicious customer, that's  
 24 a separate topic.  
 25 We had a whole different

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1151

1 witness, we had a deposition of that  
 2 witness, and this is not the witness.  
 3 MR. MAHADY: Let's keep moving.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 5 Q. This one-and-a-half-page  
 6 summary of the meeting prepared by DEA about  
 7 the DEA's meeting with AmerisourceBergen,  
 8 does it say in here, in this summary,  
 9 anywhere, that the DEA advised  
 10 AmerisourceBergen that it should not ship  
 11 orders that it reports as suspicious in  
 12 the -- I'm not talking about the  
 13 presentation, we'll get to that in a second,  
 14 but in the summary itself.  
 15 A. No.  
 16 Q. Okay. If you can turn to --  
 17 sticking with this document but turning to  
 18 the PowerPoint, I want to revisit the slide  
 19 that you looked at earlier with either  
 20 Mr. Farrell or Ms. Singer about suspicious  
 21 orders. It's on page 7, Bates ending in 155.  
 22 A. Okay.  
 23 Q. Okay. "Suspicious orders.  
 24 Reporting a suspicious order to DEA does not  
 25 relieve the distributor of the responsibility

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1153

1 order to the DEA does not relieve -- so after  
 2 the fact, yeah.  
 3 Q. Okay. If the DEA did not want  
 4 the distributors to ship orders that were  
 5 reported as suspicious, or stated  
 6 differently, after-the-fact reporting, why  
 7 didn't the DEA just say that?  
 8 A. I think it does say that.  
 9 Q. This --  
 10 A. Because the statute says you  
 11 have to maintain effective controls to guard  
 12 against diversion.  
 13 Q. Right.  
 14 But we've already --  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let the  
 16 witness answer.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 18 Q. Go ahead.  
 19 A. So the statute's already saying  
 20 you have to have something in place to  
 21 maintain effective controls. So if you  
 22 identify a suspicious order, which is prior  
 23 to shipping, you have to alleviate that.  
 24 Otherwise, you're just shipping -- you're  
 25 just shipping suspicious -- the orders that

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1152

1 to maintain effective controls against  
 2 diversion."  
 3 If I understood your testimony  
 4 earlier, you testified that this was the DEA  
 5 telling the registrants in 2005 that they  
 6 should not report orders that they deemed  
 7 suspicious; is that correct?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 9 Mischaracterizes the testimony.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Did you just say  
 11 that the DEA -- I'm not sure I  
 12 understood what you just said. I  
 13 thought you said that they weren't  
 14 supposed to tell us.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 16 Q. You testified this morning --  
 17 A. Right.  
 18 Q. -- and correct me if I'm wrong,  
 19 that it was this slide through which the DEA  
 20 was telling the distributors that they should  
 21 not ship an order that they report to the DEA  
 22 as suspicious.  
 23 Was that your testimony this  
 24 morning?  
 25 A. The reporting of suspicious

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1154

1 you have a reason or reason to believe that  
 2 it's going to be going to the illicit market.  
 3 So if you don't take the step  
 4 to alleviate the suspicions, then the  
 5 suspicions are still going down the line.  
 6 It's not -- it's not stopping.  
 7 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, I think we've  
 8 already established that the regulation does  
 9 not explicitly say do not ship orders that  
 10 you report as suspicious, right?  
 11 A. I agree with that, but the  
 12 statute says you have to have effective  
 13 means. So if -- effective means is -- if  
 14 you're -- this whole business is purchasing  
 15 and selling of controlled substances.  
 16 A. DEA registration, that's what  
 17 gives you the authority to do it legally in  
 18 the United States. So once you become a DEA  
 19 registrant, there's statutes and there's  
 20 regulations that you have to follow.  
 21 Q. Understood.  
 22 A. And the public interest  
 23 requires that you maintain effective controls  
 24 of diversion.  
 25 So if a suspicious order is

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1155

1 prior to shipment, which is -- DEA's  
 2 interpreted that, then it just -- a  
 3 reasonable deduction is that you shouldn't be  
 4 sending these down the line if you don't  
 5 alleviate that suspicion.  
 6 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, we've already  
 7 established that the DEA approved a system  
 8 with after-the-fact reporting.  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 11 Q. We also established that the  
 12 guidance from the DEA, including the guidance  
 13 provided by the chief of the section  
 14 responsible for interpreting the DEA, was at  
 15 times inconsistent on this very issue, right?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 17 Argumentative. Also object as to the  
 18 form.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 20 Q. We've already established that.  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 22 Argumentative.  
 23 You don't have to accept  
 24 counsel's representations as to what  
 25 we've established.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1157

1 And the system --  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let the  
 3 witness answer.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 5 Q. I'm sorry, Mr. Prevoznik. Were  
 6 you done or not?  
 7 A. So the operation now becomes  
 8 what was actually implemented.  
 9 Q. Okay.  
 10 A. Did Bergen follow it. So  
 11 that's why we do scheduled investigations.  
 12 That's why we come out and we review, and we  
 13 look at your -- are you following what you  
 14 say you're following. That's what we do.  
 15 Q. Okay. And the system that was  
 16 designed, that the DEA approved to implement,  
 17 using your words, had after-the-fact  
 18 reporting, correct?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 20 answered.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 23 Q. Okay. Mr. Prevoznik, I believe  
 24 on day one of your testimony you were asked  
 25 questions about specific DEA pharmaceutical

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1156

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1158

1 MR. MAHADY: That's a speaking  
 2 objection. We can limit the  
 3 objections, please.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: He's arguing  
 5 with the witness about what we've  
 6 established.  
 7 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: You can  
 8 answer the question.  
 9 THE WITNESS: I would say -- I  
 10 said from my personal view of reading  
 11 the thing that there was  
 12 inconsistency. I'm not speaking on  
 13 the DEA's behalf on that. So I don't  
 14 think that's consistent with what your  
 15 interpretation of what I said was.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 17 Q. Okay. And --  
 18 A. And I also said that the  
 19 request was can we implement the system that  
 20 Bergen designed. And we said yes, and we  
 21 worked with you to do that.  
 22 Q. Okay.  
 23 A. So again, it's the design, and  
 24 now we go to operation.  
 25 Q. Got it.

1 industry conferences, correct?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. And I believe you came back  
 4 from a break and you identified some of the  
 5 industry conferences that have been held over  
 6 the years.  
 7 A. Yes, I forgot them.  
 8 Q. Perfectly understandable.  
 9 And one of the ones that you  
 10 identified was the Houston pharmaceutical  
 11 industry conference in September of 2007,  
 12 right?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. And I'm going to mark  
 15 this as an exhibit.  
 16 (Prevoznik Exhibit 29 marked  
 17 for identification.)  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 19 Q. You can feel free to read the  
 20 whole document. I'm going to ask you about  
 21 this section, suspicious orders, on page 2.  
 22 Okay?  
 23 A. Okay.  
 24 Q. This document does not have a  
 25 Bates number. I'll represent for the record

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1159

1 that I printed it from the DEA's website  
 2 yesterday.  
 3 A. Okay.  
 4 Q. Okay. On page 2, section  
 5 captioned "Suspicious Orders."  
 6 With me?  
 7 A. Yep.  
 8 Q. Okay. The document reads,  
 9 "Michael Mapes, chief DEA regulatory section,  
 10 and Chris Zimmerman, vice president,  
 11 corporate security and regulatory affairs,  
 12 AmerisourceBergen, updated the attendees on  
 13 when suspicious orders -- reports should be  
 14 submitted to authorities."  
 15 Did I read that correctly?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. Okay. If you go to the end of  
 18 that section, it says, "Presentation slides  
 19 attached."  
 20 Have you reviewed any  
 21 presentation slides from the 2007 industry  
 22 conference relating to the presentation  
 23 provided by Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Mapes?  
 24 A. No. We couldn't find them.  
 25 Q. Okay. And a company can't just

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1161

1 A. I'm ready.  
 2 Q. All right. And before I do so,  
 3 do you remember --  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: What's your  
 5 basis for saying Mr. Mapes gave this  
 6 presentation?  
 7 MR. MAHADY: The printout from  
 8 the DEA's website that Mr. Mapes and  
 9 Mr. Zimmerman gave a presentation on  
 10 suspicious order.  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: But this just  
 12 says Zimmerman on it.  
 13 MR. MAHADY: That's fine. I  
 14 can restate.  
 15 I'll represent for the record  
 16 that the document only says  
 17 Mr. Zimmerman.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 19 Q. This morning, in response to  
 20 questions from Ms. Singer, I believe you  
 21 testified that the DEA has consistently  
 22 advised registrants that chain pharmacies  
 23 should be treated no differently than  
 24 independent retail pharmacies.  
 25 Was that your testimony?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1160

1 show up and present at the DEA's industry  
 2 conference; they have to be invited to  
 3 present by the DEA, right?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Okay. And based off of this  
 6 summary from the DEA's website, Mr. Zimmerman  
 7 and Mr. Mapes, who was then at the DEA, were  
 8 updating the attendees on when suspicious  
 9 order reports should be submitted to  
 10 authorities.  
 11 Did I read that correctly?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 (Prevoznik Exhibit 30 marked  
 14 for identification.)  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 16 Q. Okay. Now, I'm going to mark  
 17 as Prevoznik 30 a copy of the September 11,  
 18 2007 presentation that Mr. Zimmerman and  
 19 Mr. Mapes gave at the conference.  
 20 And I'm not going to ask you  
 21 about the entire presentation. I'm only  
 22 going to ask you about a couple different  
 23 slides.  
 24 So let me know when you're  
 25 ready for questions.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1162

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. Okay. And if you turn to  
 3 ABDCMDL0037190, I have a couple questions on  
 4 that point.  
 5 You with me?  
 6 A. Yep.  
 7 Q. All right. The slide is  
 8 captioned, "New Customer Due Diligence." The  
 9 first bullet, "Know your customer, due  
 10 diligence, investigations completed on all  
 11 new retail and wholesale accounts."  
 12 Did I read that correctly?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. It then says, "Retail chain  
 15 pharmacies are exempted."  
 16 That -- did I read that  
 17 correctly?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. Okay. And that piece of  
 20 information was presented by Mr. Zimmerman at  
 21 the DEA distributor initiative conference,  
 22 correct?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. And that piece of guidance was  
 25 provided to all registrants in attendance,

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1163

1 correct?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Object to the  
 3 characterization.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, this is  
 5 Mr. Zimmerman's presentation. Yes.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 7 Q. Okay. Are you aware that the  
 8 DEA informed AmerisourceBergen that retail  
 9 chain pharmacies were exempted from the know  
 10 your customer requirements?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 12 Foundation.  
 13 THE WITNESS: No.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 15 Q. Okay. But this was a  
 16 presentation that Chris Zimmerman gave at the  
 17 invitation of the DEA, correct?  
 18 A. Correct.  
 19 Q. Okay. Now, if you turn two  
 20 slides -- before we get to -- this is the  
 21 slide captioned "Order Monitoring Program."  
 22 A. Is that 192?  
 23 Q. Yep.  
 24 Before we talk about the slide  
 25 itself, Chris Zimmerman, he was the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1165

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 2 Q. Correct?  
 3 A. Yes, it appears to be.  
 4 Q. Okay. And then it goes on to  
 5 say, "ABC's OMP process is now based on  
 6 identify, capture, investigate and report  
 7 suspicious orders, all prior to shipment."  
 8 Did I read that correctly?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. And "prior to shipment" is  
 11 emphasized?  
 12 A. Yes, it's in bold.  
 13 Q. Okay. Did anyone at DEA stand  
 14 up at this conference and say,  
 15 "Mr. Zimmerman, what are you talking about?  
 16 Order monitoring has never been based on a  
 17 ship and report process"?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 19 THE WITNESS: I don't know. I  
 20 wasn't there. I don't know.  
 21 I do know based on what's on  
 22 the line, it said Mr. Mapes stated  
 23 that the responsibility for making the  
 24 decision to ship rests with the  
 25 supplier.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1164

1 individual from Bergen Brunswig who was  
 2 communicating with Mr. Gitchel and later  
 3 Ms. Good of the DEA, right?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. Okay. And so he was very  
 6 familiar with the program that was approved  
 7 for implementation by the DEA, right?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 9 Scope. Calls for speculation.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 12 Q. Okay. Mr. Zimmerman says here,  
 13 "Historically" -- in the second bullet,  
 14 "Historically, controlled substances listed  
 15 chemical order monitoring has been based on a  
 16 ship and report process."  
 17 Did I read that correctly?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. And "ship and report," that's  
 20 in bold, right?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. So he's emphasizing the ship  
 23 and report, right?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 25 Scope. Calls for speculation.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1166

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 2 Q. But online --  
 3 A. Registrants who routinely  
 4 report suspicious orders, yet fill these  
 5 orders with reason to believe they are  
 6 destined for the illicit market, are failing  
 7 to maintain effective controls against  
 8 diversion.  
 9 Q. Okay.  
 10 A. That's what Mr. Mapes said --  
 11 Q. Right. And that's --  
 12 A. -- according to this report.  
 13 Q. And I appreciate that, and  
 14 that's based off of the 2007 guidance.  
 15 But it also says, "Michael  
 16 Mapes, chief, regulatory section, and Chris  
 17 Zimmerman, vice president, corporate security  
 18 of regulatory affairs, AmerisourceBergen,  
 19 updated the attendees on when suspicious  
 20 order reports should be submitted to  
 21 authorities."  
 22 This is the update, right?  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 24 Argumentative. Scope.  
 25 You can answer.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1167

1 THE WITNESS: Well, no, I would  
 2 say this -- Mr. Zimmerman presented  
 3 what he understood as  
 4 AmerisourceBergen, and Mr. Mapes then  
 5 clarified what our position was when  
 6 he made that statement.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 8 Q. Okay.  
 9 A. But I'm just basically going  
 10 off the documents because I wasn't there.  
 11 Q. All right.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let's take  
 13 our next break in a couple of minutes.  
 14 MR. MAHADY: Yep.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 16 Q. Earlier today Ms. Singer showed  
 17 you Diversion Investigator Manuals, correct?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. You don't have to take them  
 20 out.  
 21 A. Okay.  
 22 Q. I don't think so.  
 23 Diversion Investigator Manuals,  
 24 those are internal DEA documents, right?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1169

1 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I'm  
 2 following you on that one.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 4 Q. There's no way to know whether  
 5 or not the diversion investigators deviated  
 6 from what was in those manuals, correct?  
 7 A. Correct.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 9 Scope.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Sorry. Sorry.  
 11 No.  
 12 MR. MAHADY: Let's take our  
 13 break.  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay. Thank  
 15 you.  
 16 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off  
 17 record. The time is 3:40.  
 18 (Off the record at 3:40 p.m.)  
 19 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back  
 20 on the record. Beginning of Media  
 21 File Number 8. The time is 3:51.  
 22 EXAMINATION  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 24 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Prevoznik.  
 25 My name is Tara Fumerton. And I know we met

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1168

1 Q. Okay. And what's contained in  
 2 the Diversion Investigator Manuals is not  
 3 shared with the public, correct?  
 4 A. Correct.  
 5 Q. Okay. And so a registrant  
 6 can't just go online and look up the DEA's  
 7 Diversion Investigator Manuals from 1990,  
 8 correct?  
 9 A. Correct.  
 10 Q. Okay. And so when those  
 11 Diversion Investigator Manuals were in  
 12 effect, AmerisourceBergen did not have a copy  
 13 of that manual, right?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 15 speculation. Scope.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 17 knowledge.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAHADY:  
 19 Q. Okay. And the guidance that  
 20 was in those Diversion Investigator Manuals,  
 21 there was no tracking system at the DEA to  
 22 ensure that all diversion investigators were  
 23 getting guidance consistent with what was  
 24 contained in those manuals, correct?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1170

1 during the break, but just for the record, I  
 2 represent Walmart in this litigation, and I  
 3 just have a few questions for you that  
 4 hopefully we'll be able to get through  
 5 quickly. I'm going to jump around a little  
 6 bit, so I apologize if it doesn't quite flow.  
 7 Just as a cleanup and to orient  
 8 you, during the second day of your testimony  
 9 you confirmed that the DEA did not meet with  
 10 CVS, Rite Aid, Walmart, Walgreens or HBC  
 11 Giant Eagle as part of DEA's distributor  
 12 initiative concerning Internet pharmacies,  
 13 correct?  
 14 A. Correct.  
 15 Q. And my colleague then asked you  
 16 a follow-up question to that, and the answer  
 17 got a little bit muddled, so I just wanted to  
 18 clear it up.  
 19 He asked whether the DEA  
 20 conducted a distributor briefing with these  
 21 same retail chain pharmacies related to rogue  
 22 pain clinics.  
 23 And just so that the record is  
 24 clear, the DEA did not conduct any  
 25 distributor briefing with the retail chain

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1171

1 pharmacies related to rogue pain clinics,  
 2 correct?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, but we did  
 5 meet with them in the fall of 2013,  
 6 the chain -- the chain pharmacies'  
 7 managements.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 9 Q. And when you say "the chain  
 10 pharmacies' management," what do you mean?  
 11 A. We had been doing the pharmacy  
 12 diversion awareness conferences, and during  
 13 like the first four, I think it was the first  
 14 four of these meetings, during breaks we  
 15 would be kind of scattered and being pulled  
 16 aside by a lot of -- quite a few pharmacists  
 17 and pharmacy techs. Sometimes they would say  
 18 where they were from. A lot of times they  
 19 would say they were from a chain. And we  
 20 would have discussions about what was going  
 21 on in those chains.  
 22 So after about the fourth  
 23 conference, Mr. Rannazzisi said, all right,  
 24 I've had enough. Let's get the top 33 chain  
 25 pharmacies. I want their executive

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1173

1 A. Correct.  
 2 Q. So there was not a distributor  
 3 briefing with the chain pharmacies, correct?  
 4 A. Correct.  
 5 MR. FARRELL: I'm not going to  
 6 take your time. You used the chain  
 7 pharmacies with a different lingo.  
 8 When you're talking chain  
 9 pharmacies, are you talking about in  
 10 their role as a distributor?  
 11 MS. FUMERTON: Yes.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 13 Q. Now, this morning Ms. Singer  
 14 asked you a series of questions about HDMA  
 15 industry compliance guidelines marked as  
 16 Plaintiff's Exhibit 39 and various HDMA  
 17 activities.  
 18 Do you recall that line of  
 19 questioning?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. You were aware that Walmart was  
 22 not a member of HDMA, correct?  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 24 Scope.  
 25 THE WITNESS: I was not aware.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1172

1 management there at a meeting at NABP.  
 2 I was not at that meeting, but  
 3 it was held at NABP. And the topics that the  
 4 pharmacists and the pharmacy techs from those  
 5 chain stores had -- that were brought up were  
 6 discussed with the executive management.  
 7 Q. So to be clear, you're talking  
 8 about a side meeting that occurred at an  
 9 industrywide conference; is that correct?  
 10 A. It's not -- it wasn't an  
 11 industry -- it was specifically for like the  
 12 top 30, 30, 35 chain pharmacies, that we  
 13 invited them to come to NABP, the National  
 14 Board of Pharmacies.  
 15 Q. And that's 2013, correct?  
 16 Approximately?  
 17 A. I think it was the fall  
 18 of 2012, to be honest with you.  
 19 Q. Okay. But that was not a  
 20 distributor --  
 21 A. No.  
 22 Q. -- briefing --  
 23 A. Correct.  
 24 Q. -- that you had testified about  
 25 previously, correct?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1174

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 2 Q. Do you know one way or another  
 3 whether or not Walmart was a member of HDMA?  
 4 A. I don't. I personally don't  
 5 know.  
 6 Q. If I represent that Walmart was  
 7 not a member of HDMA, do you have any reason  
 8 to disagree with that representation?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 10 for speculation.  
 11 THE WITNESS: No.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 13 Q. But you do know, because you  
 14 testified previously about this, that Walmart  
 15 only distributed controlled substances to  
 16 their own stores, correct?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 18 for speculation.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't --  
 20 I don't know if there was a Walmart  
 21 pharmacy that may have sold to  
 22 somebody else, but that would be down  
 23 the line.  
 24 Overall I know that it was --  
 25 Walmart's distribution centers sent it

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1175

1 to Walmart stores.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 3 Q. And your other commentary after  
 4 you said "yes" was simply pure speculation on  
 5 your part, correct?  
 6 A. Correct.  
 7 Q. Walmart was not a wholesale  
 8 distributor of controlled substances,  
 9 correct?  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 11 THE WITNESS: What do you mean  
 12 by that?  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 14 Q. Well, various terms have been  
 15 used by plaintiffs when asking questions, and  
 16 what I'm distinguishing between are  
 17 distributors who distribute the wholesale to  
 18 many different pharmacies, independent and  
 19 the like, and a distributor like Walmart that  
 20 only self-distributes controlled substances.  
 21 Do you understand that  
 22 distinction?  
 23 A. Yes, correct.  
 24 Q. Okay. So under that  
 25 distinction, Walmart is not a wholesale

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1177

1 registrants have to make their  
 2 decisions based on the registration.  
 3 HDMA is not a registrant.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 5 Q. You would agree that nonmembers  
 6 of HDMA might have different business models  
 7 than HDMA members, correct?  
 8 A. Yes. Yes.  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait a  
 10 minute.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 13 for speculation.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 15 Q. And the DEA expects that each  
 16 registrant will review its own business model  
 17 and design a SOM system that fits its  
 18 designed method of distribution, correct?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, you're familiar  
 21 with immediate suspension orders, correct?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. Are immediate suspension orders  
 24 also sometimes referred to as ISOs?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1176

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1178

1 distributor of controlled substances,  
 2 correct?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 6 Q. And that's true for Rite Aid as  
 7 well, correct?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 11 Q. And Walgreens, CVS and HBC  
 12 Giant Eagle, correct?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 16 Q. And would you agree that  
 17 nonmembers -- well, let me strike that.  
 18 You would agree that there may  
 19 be reasons why nonmembers of HDMA do not need  
 20 to follow HDMA guidelines, correct?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 22 Vague.  
 23 THE WITNESS: I don't even know  
 24 that the HDMA members have to follow  
 25 the guidelines either. I mean, the

1 Q. And an immediate suspension  
 2 order gives DEA the power, without notice, to  
 3 immediately freeze the prescribing ability of  
 4 a doctor who DEA believes is diverting  
 5 prescription opioids, correct?  
 6 A. Well, it could be used for  
 7 that. It could be used for other things,  
 8 too.  
 9 Q. But that's one of the things  
 10 that it could be used for, correct?  
 11 A. Correct.  
 12 Q. And an immediate suspension  
 13 order is an important tool to DEA because it  
 14 immediately stops the hemorrhaging caused by  
 15 a doctor who is diverting prescription  
 16 opioids, correct?  
 17 A. Again, yes, but it could be  
 18 more than that.  
 19 Q. So an immediate suspension  
 20 order gives DEA the ability to immediately  
 21 stop the diversion and then backtrack and  
 22 build a criminal case against the diverting  
 23 doctor, correct?  
 24 A. Well, sometimes they run  
 25 parallel.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1179

1 Q. Sometimes --  
 2 A. So it's already -- both are  
 3 already ongoing.  
 4 Q. Sometimes it can run parallel.  
 5 But are you also aware that during the 2006  
 6 to 2015 time frame when Mr. Rannazzisi ran  
 7 DEA's Office of Diversion Control, DEA  
 8 sometimes delayed filing an immediate  
 9 suspension order to allow investigators to  
 10 gather evidence for a criminal case?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 12 THE WITNESS: I don't have  
 13 specifics, but I know that that did  
 14 happen.  
 15 MS. FUMERTON: And just to  
 16 briefly address the scope objection,  
 17 Mr. Farrell started out with one of  
 18 his very first questions on day two to  
 19 Mr. Prevoznik: "The million dollar  
 20 question right out of the gate is why  
 21 didn't the DEA do more?" And then he  
 22 went on to ask a series of questions  
 23 relating to the DEA's actions and to  
 24 Mr. Patterson's -- and played  
 25 Mr. Patterson's testimony.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1181

1 counsel is asking the question.  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: We believe  
 3 we're being consistent.  
 4 You can ask your next question.  
 5 MR. FARRELL: And I prefer my  
 6 questions not be stricken.  
 7 MS. FUMERTON: And with that,  
 8 I've lost track of where we are. Give  
 9 me one second.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 11 Q. Okay. So you -- just to  
 12 reorient us, you agree that sometimes the DEA  
 13 would delay issuing an ISO with respect to a  
 14 doctor that it was investigating for  
 15 potentially diverting controlled substances,  
 16 correct?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 18 And I'm going to add that  
 19 you're instructed not to testify based  
 20 on nonpublic, law-enforcement-  
 21 sensitive information.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Based on that,  
 23 that advice, I can't answer that one.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 25 Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to show

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1180

1 And the government didn't once  
 2 make an objection to scope as to any  
 3 of that testimony.  
 4 So I would ask that either I'm  
 5 permitted to ask these questions or  
 6 all of Mr. Farrell's testimony -- or  
 7 all of Mr. Farrell's questions along  
 8 those lines be stricken.  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Without  
 10 prejudice to your motion to strike,  
 11 are you asking for an instruction that  
 12 I not object to your questions?  
 13 MS. FUMERTON: No, I'm asking  
 14 for --  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Good. I'll  
 16 make my objections. Thank you,  
 17 Counsel.  
 18 MS. FUMERTON: Okay. Well, I  
 19 will also then continue.  
 20 And as I want to make for the  
 21 record, though, the fact that the  
 22 government is being inconsistent with  
 23 respect to its objections regarding  
 24 scope, depending on whether or not  
 25 plaintiff's counsel or defendant's

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1182

1 you what was previously marked as Prevoznik  
 2 Exhibit 17.  
 3 And I apologize, I only have  
 4 two copies because I thought we would have  
 5 other copies here.  
 6 And, Mr. Prevoznik, do you  
 7 recall --  
 8 MS. SINGER: I'm sorry, what is  
 9 it?  
 10 MS. FUMERTON: It's Exhibit 17.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 12 Q. Do you recall reviewing this  
 13 exhibit in your prior testimony?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. I think your instruction by  
 16 counsel was to not answer the question unless  
 17 it was public information; is that correct?  
 18 A. Law enforcement sensitive.  
 19 Q. Well, Exhibit 17 is testimony  
 20 before Congress, correct, dated March 20,  
 21 2018?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. And you previously testified  
 24 about Mr. Patterson's other comments at this  
 25 hearing, correct?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1183

1 A. Correct.  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Lest there be  
 3 any doubt, you're permitted to testify  
 4 about Prevoznik 17.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 6 Q. So I want to turn your  
 7 attention to page 54.  
 8 A. Okay.  
 9 Q. Okay. And specifically turn to  
 10 questioning, just to orient everybody, by  
 11 Congresswoman Susan Brooks to Mr. Patterson.  
 12 And if you look about three -- one-third way  
 13 down the page, you'll see a question by  
 14 Mr. -- I'm sorry, by Mrs. Brooks, and she  
 15 asks: "Are there instances in which the DEA  
 16 pursues an immediate suspension order, the  
 17 ISO, in parallel with related potential  
 18 criminal investigation?"  
 19 Do you see that?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. And Mr. Patterson replies:  
 22 "So, ma'am, since October, so the  
 23 administration's -- the administrator's  
 24 position signs the ISOs when they're issued.  
 25 What I've traditionally seen is because of

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1185

1 MS. FUMERTON: Well, you can  
 2 use one of the government's exhibits  
 3 or we can get a copy if you need that  
 4 as well. But it was used previously,  
 5 so you should have a copy from the  
 6 prior time's exhibit.  
 7 MS. MAINIGI: It's your  
 8 document, Linda.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 10 Q. And then if you go down on that  
 11 same page, about to the bottom third, you'll  
 12 see another question from Mrs. Brooks, and  
 13 she asks: "And are you saying that the US  
 14 Attorneys were asking -- as a former  
 15 US Attorney, are you saying that US Attorneys  
 16 were asking or telling DEA not to issue  
 17 ISOs?"  
 18 And Mr. Patterson replies: "In  
 19 trying to gather evidence in their criminal  
 20 case."  
 21 Mrs. Brooks responds: "I  
 22 understand, but that can take months, if not  
 23 years, sometimes in criminal cases. Do you  
 24 believe that's what happened prior to you  
 25 coming in October of 2017, that delays

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1184

1 the process of where a criminal case is being  
 2 investigated, there's been a delay in the ISO  
 3 process as they're gathering evidence. One  
 4 of the concerns I have, and it goes back to  
 5 again what Mr. Griffith said, is that cuts  
 6 against the very argument that we have an  
 7 imminent problem that we are trying to deal  
 8 with."  
 9 Do you see that?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. And so Mr. Patterson was  
 12 testifying here that the DEA, in fact, was  
 13 delaying in issuing ISOs to allow criminal  
 14 investigations to occur, correct?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 16 Mischaracterizes the document.  
 17 You can answer.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 19 MS. SINGER: Can I just  
 20 interject and ask that you get copies  
 21 at the next break in case there's any  
 22 redirect that needs to be done here?  
 23 It's a little unfair to question the  
 24 witness when there isn't a copy of the  
 25 exhibit.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1186

1 happened?"  
 2 And Mr. Patterson replies: "I  
 3 think that's been an ongoing theme of what  
 4 some of these delays are caused by."  
 5 Do you see that?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Do you have any reason to  
 8 disagree with Mr. Patterson's testimony?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 10 THE WITNESS: No.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 12 Q. And so that meant that for  
 13 months, if not years, while these  
 14 investigations were occurring, the DEA  
 15 permitted doctors it believed were diverting  
 16 opioids to continue to divert opioids,  
 17 correct?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 19 Argumentative.  
 20 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, can  
 21 you repeat it?  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. FUMERTON:  
 23 Q. Sure.  
 24 And so that means that for  
 25 months, if not years, the DEA permitted

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1187

1 doctors it believed were diverting opioids to  
 2 continue to divert opioids, correct?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 4 objections.  
 5 THE WITNESS: It's possible,  
 6 yeah.  
 7 MS. FUMERTON: I am going to  
 8 pass the witness at this time.  
 9 Thank you very much for your  
 10 time.  
 11 Can we go off the record while  
 12 we switch?  
 13 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off  
 14 the record. The time is 4:07.  
 15 (Off the record at 4:07 p.m.)  
 16 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back  
 17 on record. Beginning of Media File  
 18 Number 9. Time is 4:08.  
 19 EXAMINATION  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 21 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, I'm Andrew  
 22 O'Connor. I represent one of the  
 23 manufacturers in the case. We met last time  
 24 we were here.  
 25 A. Good to see you again.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1189

1 relevant information.  
 2 Is that a fair characterization  
 3 of what you said earlier?  
 4 A. They're in a better position.  
 5 They deal with the customer on a more daily  
 6 basis.  
 7 Q. And would you say they're in a  
 8 better position than DEA?  
 9 A. To assess their customer? Yes.  
 10 Q. And to assess the adequacy and  
 11 effectiveness of their suspicious order  
 12 monitoring program?  
 13 A. I'm sorry, you're losing me on  
 14 that one.  
 15 Q. Would you say that a registrant  
 16 is in a better position than DEA to assess  
 17 the adequacy and effectiveness of its  
 18 suspicious order monitoring program?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 20 Vague.  
 21 THE WITNESS: No, I wouldn't  
 22 agree with that.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 24 Q. Okay. So DEA is in a better  
 25 position than the registrant to assess the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1188

1 Q. Good to see you.  
 2 I'll try to be brief here.  
 3 Is it fair for me to say that  
 4 DEA does not advise registrants on whether  
 5 they have an adequate and effective  
 6 suspicious order monitoring program?  
 7 A. We don't advise?  
 8 Q. Correct.  
 9 A. No, I don't think that's fair  
 10 to say that. I think when we -- when we sit  
 11 down and talk to them and they present what  
 12 they're having, we're in listening mode. We  
 13 offer suggestions, so that would be advising.  
 14 Q. Okay. Does DEA approve any  
 15 particular suspicious order monitoring  
 16 program?  
 17 A. No.  
 18 Q. And why is that?  
 19 A. Because it's ultimately -- it's  
 20 incumbent upon the registrant to design and  
 21 operate the system, so it's a business  
 22 decision made by the registrant.  
 23 Q. And I believe you testified  
 24 earlier to the fact that one of the reasons  
 25 is because the registrant is the one that has

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1190

1 program?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 3 Mischaracterizes prior testimony.  
 4 THE WITNESS: I think -- I  
 5 think, again, it's the design and it's  
 6 the operating. So what is the  
 7 operating -- what is the registrant  
 8 doing to make the -- when they  
 9 implement it, what are they -- what  
 10 are -- are they following the  
 11 guidelines that they said that they  
 12 were going to design, or are they  
 13 starting the shift to change when a  
 14 customer comes in and asks for -- is  
 15 on-boarding. Are they looking at all  
 16 the parameters that the customer --  
 17 whether it's the questionnaire. Are  
 18 they validating all those types of  
 19 things.  
 20 It has to do with are they  
 21 increasing thresholds when they're  
 22 asked for a threshold increase. Are  
 23 they just arbitrarily increasing it to  
 24 some higher number or is there a  
 25 scientific basis that makes that

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1191

1 determination.  
 2 So that's what we look at when  
 3 we go back and look at the system.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 5 Q. I just want to get back to my  
 6 question, because I had understood your  
 7 testimony earlier today to be that DEA would  
 8 not weigh in on the adequacy of a suspicious  
 9 order monitoring program because it was the  
 10 registrant and not DEA who had the right  
 11 information to make that assessment.  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 13 answered. Mischaracterizes prior  
 14 testimony.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 16 Q. Do you agree with my  
 17 characterization of what you said earlier  
 18 today?  
 19 A. No, I don't agree with your  
 20 characterization.  
 21 Q. Okay. So do you think the DEA  
 22 then is in a better position to make  
 23 assessments about the suspicious order  
 24 monitoring programs than the registrants are?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague. Asked

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1193

1 their customer -- if the next -- if the next  
 2 line down is to the distributors, they should  
 3 know what kind of program they have.  
 4 Q. And I believe you indicated  
 5 it's DEA's position that manufacturers are  
 6 supposed to make that assessment of the  
 7 distributor's suspicious order monitoring  
 8 program before they begin a business  
 9 relationship with the distributor; is that  
 10 fair?  
 11 A. Yes. Know your customer.  
 12 Q. And just to be clear,  
 13 manufacturers are supposed to assess whether  
 14 the distributor's program is adequate and  
 15 effective?  
 16 A. They should know what it is,  
 17 but, again, as I -- manufacturers also  
 18 distribute not just to distributors. They  
 19 also go to practitioners, sometimes  
 20 pharmacies, directly. So they also have to  
 21 have the ability to have a suspicious order  
 22 monitoring system for those registrants as  
 23 well in place.  
 24 Q. I understand.  
 25 I just want to be very clear

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1192

1 and answered.  
 2 THE WITNESS: The suspicious  
 3 order monitoring system is incumbent  
 4 upon the registrant to design it and  
 5 operate it. They are in the position  
 6 that knows their customers. We don't  
 7 know their customers.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 9 Q. Okay. Only the registrant --  
 10 A. So therefore --  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let him  
 12 finish.  
 13 THE WITNESS: So, therefore,  
 14 the registrant is in a better position  
 15 to assess their customers.  
 16 How they assess it is something  
 17 that they do and that we do.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 19 Q. Okay. Earlier today I believe  
 20 you testified that manufacturers should make  
 21 sure that distributors' suspicious order  
 22 monitoring programs are adequate and  
 23 effective.  
 24 Did I get that right?  
 25 A. Yeah, they should know what

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1194

1 about what the DEA contends a manufacturer  
 2 has to do, because earlier it sounded like  
 3 you were saying they need to assess whether a  
 4 distributor's suspicious order monitoring  
 5 program was, in fact, effective.  
 6 Is that correct?  
 7 A. Well, they should know if their  
 8 customer's system is guarding -- is it  
 9 guarding against the diversion into the  
 10 illicit market.  
 11 Q. And is the DEA's position that  
 12 they should make that assessment even in  
 13 situations where the DEA has refused to make  
 14 that assessment?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 16 Argumentative. Foundation.  
 17 THE WITNESS: You lost me on  
 18 that one.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 20 Q. Well, DEA doesn't tell a  
 21 registrant whether its program works or not,  
 22 does it?  
 23 A. Well --  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 25 Mischaracterizes prior testimony.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1195

1 THE WITNESS: When --  
 2 MR. O'CONNOR: Just a question.  
 3 THE WITNESS: When we sit with  
 4 the registrant, the registrant  
 5 explains what their ordering sys --  
 6 their suspicious order system is to  
 7 us.  
 8 So then when we come back, we  
 9 look. Are, in fact, they -- are they  
 10 doing what they said they're doing,  
 11 and is the system able to identify  
 12 suspicious orders. That's what we do.  
 13 And our parameters of doing  
 14 that are the public interest. So are  
 15 there -- do they have in place the  
 16 means to identify them and also  
 17 safeguard and have effective measures  
 18 to not allow for diversion.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 20 Q. Is there any statute or  
 21 regulation that you're aware of that says  
 22 manufacturers are supposed to assess whether  
 23 a distributor's suspicious order monitoring  
 24 program is adequate?  
 25 A. Not specifically that language.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1197

1 review -- or registrants generally should  
 2 review information regarding physician  
 3 prescribing information.  
 4 Is that a fair assessment of  
 5 what you said?  
 6 A. Yes, if they have it.  
 7 Q. Okay. Did DEA have physician  
 8 prescribing information?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm going to  
 10 instruct you not to answer about the  
 11 availability of data sources to the  
 12 extent that they're nonpublic.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat  
 14 the question?  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 16 Q. Sure.  
 17 Did DEA have physician  
 18 prescribing information?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: And my  
 20 instruction, no nonpublic data or  
 21 techniques.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Right. No, we  
 23 didn't -- we have to get it through a  
 24 different means.  
 25 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1196

1 Q. Okay.  
 2 A. It would fall under the statute  
 3 of effective means.  
 4 Q. And that provision that talks  
 5 about effective controls doesn't mention  
 6 anything about assessing another registrant's  
 7 suspicious order monitoring program, correct?  
 8 A. Correct.  
 9 Q. And DEA never issued any  
 10 guidance to manufacturers informing them that  
 11 they were supposed to assess another  
 12 registrant's program, correct?  
 13 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 14 Q. DEA never sent a letter to that  
 15 effect to manufacturers?  
 16 A. Probably happened in the  
 17 manufacturing -- when we met with the  
 18 manufacturer. Like the distributor  
 19 initiative with a manufacturer, we went over  
 20 that.  
 21 Q. Can you say, sitting here today  
 22 under oath, that that happened?  
 23 A. I don't know, but I --  
 24 Q. Okay. Earlier today I believe  
 25 you testified that manufacturers should

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1198

1 Q. Okay. Let me ask you this:  
 2 Are you familiar with IMS or IQVIA data?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. Did DEA have access to IMS or  
 5 IQVIA data that described the number of  
 6 prescriptions written by particular  
 7 physicians?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. No  
 9 law-enforcement-sensitive information.  
 10 Okay?  
 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 12 We do use IQVIA data, but  
 13 that's for quotas. Quota section uses  
 14 that. It doesn't go down to that  
 15 granular -- that's my understanding,  
 16 it does not go down to that granular  
 17 level that you're describing.  
 18 We have asked. We have been  
 19 trying to get that data, but we have  
 20 been unsuccessful at this point.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 22 Q. And as someone who oversees the  
 23 targeting and analysis unit, if there was  
 24 information available publicly that you felt  
 25 was useful to the DEA identifying diversion,

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1199

1 you would seek it out, correct?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 3 hypothetical.  
 4 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 6 Q. Okay. But you do not have  
 7 prescriber-level IMS or IQVIA data, true?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 9 instruction.  
 10 THE WITNESS: As I previously  
 11 said, we do have some, but it's used  
 12 at the quota level, not to the  
 13 granular level that you're talking  
 14 about. We do not have it.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 16 Q. And there is no statute or  
 17 regulation that you're aware of that  
 18 indicates that manufacturers were required to  
 19 analyze prescriber-level data in connection  
 20 with their DEA compliance activities,  
 21 correct?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 23 answered.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Correct. But if  
 25 they have it, then they should look at

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1201

1 Go off the record.  
 2 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the  
 3 record. The time is 4:19.  
 4 (Off the record at 4:19 p.m.)  
 5 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back on  
 6 the record. Beginning of Media  
 7 File 10. The time is 4:20.  
 8 EXAMINATION  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MR. EPPICH:  
 10 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Prevoznik.  
 11 You may recall my name is Chris Eppich, and I  
 12 represent the McKesson distributors in this  
 13 litigation. I just have a couple of  
 14 questions for you this afternoon.  
 15 Are you aware of the federal  
 16 sentencing guidelines?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MR. EPPICH:  
 20 Q. Are you aware that the federal  
 21 sentencing guidelines are used by courts in  
 22 sentencing after a verdict in a criminal  
 23 case?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1200

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1202

1 it.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MR. O'CONNOR:  
 3 Q. Even though it's not in the  
 4 statute or the regulation?  
 5 A. It's knowing your customer.  
 6 It's putting effective means -- guarding  
 7 against diversion. So if the information  
 8 helps you understand your customer better and  
 9 stops diversion, then you should be looking  
 10 at it.  
 11 Q. Did DEA ever indicate in any  
 12 kind of written guidance document that  
 13 manufacturers should be analyzing prescriber  
 14 data in order to fulfill their DEA  
 15 obligations?  
 16 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 17 Q. DEA never sent any letters to  
 18 the industry to that effect?  
 19 A. I'm not aware of it.  
 20 Q. And DEA never posted anything  
 21 on its website informing manufacturers of its  
 22 view on this issue?  
 23 A. Not to my knowledge.  
 24 MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you for  
 25 your time.

1 QUESTIONS BY MR. EPPICH:  
 2 Q. The DEA doesn't use the federal  
 3 sentencing guidelines to evaluate  
 4 registrants' suspicious order monitoring  
 5 programs, correct?  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 7 Vague.  
 8 THE WITNESS: Yes. Correct.  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MR. EPPICH:  
 10 Q. Correct that they do not?  
 11 A. Do not.  
 12 Q. Thank you, sir.  
 13 Now, when you were training  
 14 diversion investigators, did you ever  
 15 instruct diversion investigators to rely on  
 16 the federal sentencing guidelines to evaluate  
 17 registrants' suspicious order monitoring  
 18 programs?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 20 THE WITNESS: No.  
 21 MR. EPPICH: Thank you. Let's  
 22 go off the record.  
 23 VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off  
 24 record. The time is 4:21.  
 25 (Off the record at 4:21 p.m.)

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1203

1 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back  
 2 on record. Beginning of Media  
 3 File 11. The time is 4:23.  
 4 EXAMINATION  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 6 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, you recall we  
 7 met a few weeks ago on the first day or two  
 8 of your deposition.  
 9 I'm going to ask you some more  
 10 questions. I'm here representing Cardinal  
 11 Health.  
 12 Mr. Prevoznik, you did not  
 13 speak to Mr. Mapes prior to coming here  
 14 today, did you?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 16 answered several times.  
 17 THE WITNESS: No.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 19 Q. Okay. And you had not spoken  
 20 to him prior to day one and day two?  
 21 A. Correct.  
 22 Q. And you did not speak to  
 23 Mr. Wright prior to coming today?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 25 answered.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1205

1 Q. And you were a diversion  
 2 investigator until 2001?  
 3 A. Well, I still think I am.  
 4 Q. That's right.  
 5 A. Still have the same job series.  
 6 Q. Your primary duty was as a  
 7 diversion investigator until 2001?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. And in that situation, you were  
 10 out in the field offices?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. Okay. And you joined the  
 13 Office of Diversion Control at headquarters  
 14 in May 2012?  
 15 A. I believe it was April.  
 16 Q. Okay. Now, the last several  
 17 days you've been asked a number of questions  
 18 about suspicious orders, true?  
 19 A. True.  
 20 Q. And suspicious, that term has a  
 21 particular meaning in the context of  
 22 controlled substances, correct?  
 23 A. Correct.  
 24 Q. And the CFR defines suspicious  
 25 order as including orders of unusual size,

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1204

1 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 3 Q. And is it true that you've only  
 4 still reviewed the questions from  
 5 Mr. Wright's deposition, not the answers?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. You've never gone back to  
 8 review the answers to Mr. Wright's  
 9 deposition, only the questions?  
 10 A. Correct.  
 11 Q. And that was at the instruction  
 12 of your counsel?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 14 I'm going to instruct you not  
 15 to answer that.  
 16 MS. MAINIGI: I think he  
 17 answered that before.  
 18 I'll withdraw the question.  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I don't think  
 20 he did, but I appreciate you  
 21 withdrawing the question.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 23 Q. Mr. Prevoznik, you arrived at  
 24 the DEA in 1991; is that right?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1206

1 orders of unusual frequency and orders that  
 2 deviate substantially from a normal ordering  
 3 pattern, correct?  
 4 A. Correct.  
 5 Q. Excuse me.  
 6 Now, not every order of unusual  
 7 size is indicative of diversion, correct?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 9 answered.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 12 Q. There could be legitimate  
 13 reasons for a pharmacy to place an order of  
 14 unusual size, correct?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 16 answered.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 19 Q. Can you think of any examples  
 20 that come to mind for that, Mr. Prevoznik?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 22 speculation.  
 23 THE WITNESS: For which one?  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 25 Q. Why a pharmacy may place a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1207

1 larger than usual order.  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 3 for speculation.  
 4 You can answer in your  
 5 individual capacity.  
 6 THE WITNESS: It could be a new  
 7 hospital opened, a new clinic opened.  
 8 A. new hospice center could have  
 9 opened. Any one of those.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. And, Mr. Prevoznik, not every  
 12 order of unusual frequency is indicative of  
 13 diversion, correct?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 15 answered.  
 16 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 18 Q. There could be legitimate  
 19 reasons for an order of unusual frequency,  
 20 true?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 22 objection.  
 23 THE WITNESS: True.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 25 Q. Can you think of some examples

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1209

1 answered.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 4 Q. And could there be legitimate  
 5 reasons for an ordering pattern that is  
 6 abnormal in some manner?  
 7 A. Yeah, there could be.  
 8 Q. And what are some of those  
 9 reasons?  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 11 for speculation.  
 12 You can answer in your  
 13 individual capacity.  
 14 THE WITNESS: I'm not really  
 15 sure I have an example off the top of  
 16 my head on that one right now.  
 17 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 18 Q. Well, how does one define a  
 19 normal ordering pattern or something that  
 20 diverges from a normal ordering pattern?  
 21 A. Well, the example I would give  
 22 you is you have a pharmacist, they have their  
 23 order, and they will put two down. But they  
 24 don't see that one of their employees, who is  
 25 either working or not working, has added to

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1208

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1210

1 as to why a pharmacy may place an order that  
 2 is of unusual frequency?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 4 for speculation.  
 5 You can answer in your  
 6 individual capacity.  
 7 THE WITNESS: Again, it could  
 8 be a new customer base, prescriber, a  
 9 new doctor's office opened.  
 10 That probably would be for a  
 11 period of time, and then it would not  
 12 keep going and going. It would level  
 13 out at some point.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 15 Q. But it could certainly explain  
 16 a deviation that resulted in an unusual  
 17 frequency for a month or two, correct?  
 18 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 21 Q. Now, Mr. Prevoznik, not every  
 22 order that deviates substantially from a  
 23 normal ordering pattern is indicative of  
 24 diversion, correct?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and

1 the order. So they could be at their house,  
 2 whatever, added a bottle, two bottles, but  
 3 it's later.  
 4 So at the end of the day, the  
 5 pharmacist -- they know the pattern of the  
 6 pharmacist is not to review, that they just  
 7 hit "submit," but they know that they're  
 8 going to be on the job the next day. So they  
 9 come in the next day, they already know  
 10 there's two extra bottles or an extra bottle  
 11 coming in. So that they've been doing this  
 12 for months and month and months, that they've  
 13 been stealing from, diverting out of the  
 14 pharmacy, because they know the habits of the  
 15 pharmacist.  
 16 It could be at a hospital. It  
 17 could be at a -- just anywhere. If they know  
 18 the habits, they're going to figure it out.  
 19 Q. So the placing of an order of  
 20 unusual size, pattern or frequency, standing  
 21 alone, does not indicate that a customer is  
 22 diverting controlled substances, correct?  
 23 A. Well, I mean, it's disjunctive,  
 24 so it could be one of them; it could be two  
 25 of them; it could be three of them; it could be

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1211

1 a combination.  
 2 And so in the example I  
 3 would -- I would say is -- I think I've used  
 4 it before was the veterinarian that is  
 5 ordering Vicodin with the acetaminophen that  
 6 is toxic to cats and dogs. So that in  
 7 itself, an order of that, would be why are  
 8 they doing that.  
 9 Q. But standing alone, without  
 10 follow-up due diligence, it is not  
 11 necessarily always possible to determine  
 12 whether an order that is an unusual size,  
 13 unusual pattern or frequency is, by itself,  
 14 for that reason, indicative of diversion,  
 15 correct?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 17 answered. Incomplete hypothetical.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 20 Q. And so some sort of follow-up  
 21 due diligence needs to be done by the  
 22 distributor or registrant, correct?  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 24 hypothetical. Asked and answered.  
 25 THE WITNESS: Right.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1213

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, it would be  
 2 good practice.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 4 Q. And but the DEA has not issued  
 5 any sort of guidelines indicating how due  
 6 diligence should be conducted, true?  
 7 A. I mean, I would say that the  
 8 letters in 2006 and 2007 have certain  
 9 questions to be asked, so that's a guide of  
 10 what should be asked or what should be looked  
 11 for.  
 12 Q. Those are Mr. Rannazzisi's  
 13 letters?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. And Mr. Rannazzisi's letters  
 16 touched on a few different areas, correct?  
 17 A. Correct.  
 18 Q. Let me try to focus on  
 19 guidelines that might be specific to the idea  
 20 of due diligence.  
 21 Are there -- are you aware of  
 22 DEA ever issuing any guidelines specific to  
 23 due diligence that describe how due diligence  
 24 should be conducted?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1212

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1214

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 2 Q. And with respect to -- we've  
 3 talked a bit about due diligence in the last  
 4 couple of days of your deposition.  
 5 Do you recall that?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. Okay. And with respect to --  
 8 you've been asked questions by both  
 9 Mr. Farrell and Ms. Singer about  
 10 documentation related to due diligence.  
 11 Do you recall that?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. And I believe that you  
 14 indicated that there was not any sort of  
 15 requirement by the DEA of the maintenance of  
 16 due diligence files, correct?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 18 Mischaracterizes prior testimony.  
 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 21 Q. Now certainly the DEA's view  
 22 appears to be that due diligence is a good  
 23 practice or a best practice, fair?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 25 Mischaracterizes prior testimony.

1 answered.  
 2 THE WITNESS: No, not -- it's  
 3 the statute and the regulation.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 5 Q. And the statute and regulation  
 6 do not specifically speak to due diligence,  
 7 correct?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 9 answered.  
 10 THE WITNESS: No. I mean, they  
 11 do, because they're saying you have to  
 12 have effective means to guard against  
 13 diversion. So that's the guide.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 15 Q. Let me come back to -- it's  
 16 effective controls, correct?  
 17 A. Effective.  
 18 Q. Let me come back to that.  
 19 Let's focus just on the phrase "due  
 20 diligence."  
 21 Are you aware of the phrase  
 22 "due diligence" being in either the statute  
 23 or the regulation?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 25 answered.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1215

1 THE WITNESS: It's not.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 3 Q. Now, you've referred, I think,  
 4 just now and in the last several days to the  
 5 term "effective controls," correct?  
 6 A. Correct.  
 7 Q. And that term is in the statute  
 8 or the regulation, correct?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 10 answered.  
 11 THE WITNESS: Correct.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 13 Q. Okay. Has the DEA ever  
 14 explained in guidance what effective controls  
 15 means?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague. Asked  
 17 and answered.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Effective  
 19 controls. Well, they have to follow  
 20 the rest of the statute to meet  
 21 effective controls to guard against  
 22 diversion.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 24 Q. So has the DEA ever issued any  
 25 guidance, Mr. Prevoznik, that serves as a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1217

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 2 Q. They might have some sort of  
 3 requirement to hold on to documents or data  
 4 for seven years or something of the sort?  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 6 Foundation.  
 7 You can answer in your personal  
 8 capacity.  
 9 THE WITNESS: I know that there  
 10 are certain years that certain  
 11 documents can be -- that are supposed  
 12 to be either archived or -- and then  
 13 once it gets archived, I have no idea.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 15 Q. Are there certain documents  
 16 that you hold on to in your job at DEA that  
 17 you hold on to for a certain number of years  
 18 because you know you're required to?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 22 Q. And what kind of documents are  
 23 those?  
 24 A. Oh --  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1216

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1218

1 checklist, for example, of everything that  
 2 would go into effective controls?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague. Asked  
 4 and answered.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 6 knowledge.  
 7 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 8 Q. Coming back to the concept of  
 9 due diligence, the DEA has not issued any  
 10 guidance specifying how long a registrant  
 11 must hold on to due diligence, correct?  
 12 A. Correct.  
 13 Q. Does the DEA have any sort of  
 14 guidelines as to how long the DEA is required  
 15 to hold on to certain types of documents?  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 17 You can answer, if you know.  
 18 THE WITNESS: Yes, they do.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 20 Q. Can you describe some for me?  
 21 A. I don't know.  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 23 THE WITNESS: I don't know  
 24 them, but I know they're out there.  
 25

1 MS. MAINIGI: I'm sorry.  
 2 THE WITNESS: I was waiting for  
 3 him.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 5 You can answer in your personal  
 6 capacity.  
 7 THE WITNESS: I know that we  
 8 hold on to ARCOS, ARCOS data, drug  
 9 theft loss.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. And do you know approximately  
 12 how long you're required to hold on to ARCOS  
 13 data?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 15 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 17 Q. The DEA has certainly never  
 18 issued any sort of guidance indicating that  
 19 registrants must hold on to due diligence  
 20 files for 15 years, correct?  
 21 A. Yes. The only guidance I know  
 22 is it's two years, two years for  
 23 recordkeeping for the registrant.  
 24 Q. Okay.  
 25 A. For us.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1219

1 Q. But there's no requirement that  
 2 a due diligence file even be maintained,  
 3 correct?  
 4 A. Correct.  
 5 Q. So the two-year rule does not  
 6 apply to any due diligence files, per se,  
 7 correct?  
 8 A. Correct. I was just pointing  
 9 out that within the regs, there is records  
 10 for a two-year period.  
 11 Q. Due diligence is certainly an  
 12 important part of this process, right?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 16 Q. Why do you think the DEA has  
 17 never issued any specific guidance on due  
 18 diligence?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 20 Instruct you not to answer to  
 21 the extent that the answer calls for  
 22 predecisional deliberative  
 23 communications within the Department  
 24 of Justice.  
 25 THE WITNESS: I don't know.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1221

1 THE WITNESS: No.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 3 Q. Has the DEA issued any sort of  
 4 guidance indicating how long a suspicious  
 5 order that's been reported must be  
 6 maintained?  
 7 A. No.  
 8 Q. Now, I think with one of the  
 9 prior questioners there was reference to --  
 10 well, let me back up.  
 11 You prepared back to 1996 for  
 12 this deposition, approximately, correct?  
 13 A. Well, I mean, I had -- I --  
 14 from the letters that you saw, I had some  
 15 letters from 1980s that I saw.  
 16 Q. So you prepared for various  
 17 earlier periods of time?  
 18 A. I looked for what I could find.  
 19 Q. Okay. And did you speak to any  
 20 folks in the field offices to help yourself  
 21 prepare for this deposition?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 23 answered.  
 24 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1220

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1222

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 2 Q. Now, is there any sort of  
 3 requirement -- I'm going to come back to  
 4 suspicious orders.  
 5 Is there any kind of  
 6 requirement to hold on to suspicious orders  
 7 themselves that are reported?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 9 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I'm  
 10 following on that.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 12 Q. Well, so, for example, if -- I  
 13 think when you were talking to one of the  
 14 other questioners, there was some reference  
 15 to perhaps at some point in time suspicious  
 16 orders being faxed in to the DEA.  
 17 Do you remember that  
 18 discussion?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. Is there any sort of  
 21 requirement, either by the DEA or by the  
 22 registrant, to hold on to an actual  
 23 suspicious order being reported to the DEA?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 25 Vague. Calls for speculation.

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 2 Q. And who were the folks you  
 3 spoke to from the field office?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 5 answered.  
 6 THE WITNESS: Scott Collier,  
 7 Ruth Carter, Susan Langston, Lisa  
 8 Sullivan, David White, Scott Garriott.  
 9 I'm trying to think.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. And those were all folks that  
 12 were in the field offices in years prior?  
 13 A. Yeah, they were in the field.  
 14 They've been -- they're in the field now.  
 15 Q. Okay. So you're aware through  
 16 your own experience in the field as well as  
 17 the conversations you had that the  
 18 requirement of the regulation and the statute  
 19 is that suspicious orders generally are  
 20 reported to the local or regional DEA  
 21 offices, correct?  
 22 A. Correct.  
 23 Q. And then it's up to the local  
 24 or regional DEA offices to ultimately make a  
 25 decision about whether to investigate a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1223

1 suspicious order, correct?  
 2 A. That's part of the process.  
 3 The other part is if it's not in their area,  
 4 then they would send it to that respective  
 5 office. So that would be the other part.  
 6 Q. But once it gets to the right  
 7 regional office, it is incumbent upon that  
 8 regional office to make a decision about what  
 9 to do with a suspicious order, correct?  
 10 A. Correct.  
 11 Q. And is it fair to say not every  
 12 suspicious order that is reported to a  
 13 regional office actually results in some sort  
 14 of investigation?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 16 answered.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 19 Q. Do you have any sense of how  
 20 many, percentagewise, ballpark, of actual  
 21 reported suspicious orders result in  
 22 investigations by the DEA?  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Asked  
 24 and answered. Calls for speculation.  
 25 THE WITNESS: No, I don't.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1225

1 we're talking about? That would help  
 2 me a little bit.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 4 Q. I'm sorry. Let's say 1996  
 5 through 2006 for the first time period.  
 6 A. So if they came in, then we  
 7 would follow up with the registrant and ask:  
 8 Why did you file this? Ask for a reason as  
 9 to why you filed this. Because sometimes it  
 10 was just a sheet of paper that said,  
 11 diazepam, one bottle of 500. Well, that  
 12 doesn't really give us much of a --  
 13 information to act on, so we would have to  
 14 follow up on that.  
 15 Q. And I think you spoke to  
 16 earlier the fact that sometimes suspicious  
 17 orders would be called in to the regional  
 18 office, correct?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. And I assume that -- if we kind  
 21 of use 1996 as a baseline, that in the late  
 22 '90s, early aughts, there were often  
 23 suspicious orders called in to the regional  
 24 offices, true?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1224

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 2 Q. Do you think more than half do?  
 3 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 4 objections.  
 5 You can answer in your personal  
 6 capacity.  
 7 THE WITNESS: No, I don't. I  
 8 don't know. I couldn't put a number  
 9 on it.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. You don't have any sort of  
 12 educated guess on that even?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same  
 14 objection.  
 15 You can answer in your personal  
 16 capacity.  
 17 THE WITNESS: The reports that  
 18 you got, it would be -- when we would  
 19 go out, we would be like, was one  
 20 filed or wasn't one filed.  
 21 So if one was filed, then we  
 22 would know -- we would typically go  
 23 out and ask: Why did you file this?  
 24 Because sometimes -- I mean, I  
 25 don't know -- what is the time frame

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1226

1 for speculation.  
 2 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say  
 3 often. I mean, it was more the  
 4 excessive purchase reports is what we  
 5 got.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 7 Q. Well, and I asked you to just  
 8 focus on whatever universe of suspicious  
 9 orders you got in that time period. Let's  
 10 say late '90s, early aughts.  
 11 Of the suspicious orders that  
 12 were being reported in that time period, is  
 13 it fair to say that a good number were called  
 14 in to the regional offices?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 16 Vague. Calls for speculation.  
 17 THE WITNESS: I personally  
 18 don't know because I worked in the  
 19 Philadelphia office, so I don't know  
 20 how registrants were reporting during  
 21 that period in '96.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 23 Q. But you were in the  
 24 Philadelphia regional office, correct?  
 25 A. Correct.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1227

1 Q. And were you generally aware of  
 2 registrants calling in to report suspicious  
 3 orders from time to time?  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 5 THE WITNESS: At that point, it  
 6 was more chemicals. They were calling  
 7 in chemicals.  
 8 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 9 Q. Because that --  
 10 A. That would be it. It was the  
 11 methamphetamine -- we had the methamphetamine  
 12 epidemic at that point.  
 13 Q. Because there was an obligation  
 14 to report not just suspicious orders of  
 15 controlled substances but suspicious orders  
 16 of meth as well, true?  
 17 A. Listed chemicals to -- that  
 18 make meth.  
 19 Q. But --  
 20 A. We would have loved to have the  
 21 means for meth, but...  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Tom, answer  
 23 the questions.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 25 Q. The suspicious orders of -- the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1229

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 2 You can answer, if you know.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Don't know.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 5 Q. You don't know how long the DEA  
 6 was required to hold on to suspicious orders  
 7 reported?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 9 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. Okay. And would the suspicious  
 12 orders that were phoned or faxed in or mailed  
 13 in, for that matter, to the regional offices,  
 14 would they ever even find their way to  
 15 headquarters for any reason?  
 16 A. It was on --  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 18 for speculation.  
 19 THE WITNESS: If it was on a  
 20 report it would, because the reports  
 21 get -- go to headquarters.  
 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 23 Q. If it was on what type of  
 24 report?  
 25 A. One of our official reports.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1228

1 suspicious orders that were reported for  
 2 controlled substances from time to time did  
 3 get phoned in, correct?  
 4 A. There were some that were  
 5 phoned in, yes.  
 6 Q. And there were some that were  
 7 faxed in, correct?  
 8 A. Correct.  
 9 Q. And what are the other means  
 10 that suspicious orders came in to the field  
 11 offices?  
 12 A. Mailed in. Pretty much it.  
 13 They were phone, fax or mail.  
 14 Q. Okay. And if a suspicious  
 15 order was phoned in, how did the DEA then  
 16 maintain a record of that suspicious order?  
 17 MR. FINKELSTEIN: '96 to 2006?  
 18 MS. MAINIGI: Sure. Go with  
 19 that.  
 20 THE WITNESS: Document.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 22 Q. Documented?  
 23 A. Document.  
 24 Q. And then are those documents  
 25 still in existence?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1230

1 Q. An internal report?  
 2 A. An internal report, yes.  
 3 Q. And what are some of the type  
 4 of internal reports?  
 5 You don't need to describe them  
 6 for me, but just what are some of the types  
 7 of internal reports that would get sent from  
 8 the field offices to headquarters --  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. -- that would contain  
 12 suspicious orders?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 14 THE WITNESS: It could be  
 15 scheduled investigation reports. It  
 16 could be part of the preregistration.  
 17 It could just be the suspicious order  
 18 itself.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 20 Q. And what are some of the  
 21 reasons that the suspicious orders would be  
 22 sent up to headquarters?  
 23 A. We have a system that all  
 24 reports have to go to this one section to  
 25 update a system that we have.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1231

1 Q. That's the ARCOS system or some  
 2 other system?  
 3 A. No, some other system.  
 4 Q. What's the name of the system?  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 6 THE WITNESS: I mean, it's --  
 7 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait. Hang  
 8 on. If this was law enforcement  
 9 sensitive, don't testify.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. Is this related to law  
 12 enforcement?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Okay. We can -- I can withdraw  
 15 that question.  
 16 Now, let me take you -- let me  
 17 switch gears for a moment here.  
 18 I think either -- I think the  
 19 second day you testified, you were asked if  
 20 the DEA agreed that if the distributor  
 21 determined that an order is suspicious and  
 22 should be blocked, the distributor should  
 23 terminate all sales to that customer until  
 24 they can rule out diversion is occurring.  
 25 Do you recall that question?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1233

1 customer if you report an order to the DEA?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 3 answered. Mischaracterizes the  
 4 testimony.  
 5 THE WITNESS: Well, it depends  
 6 what they're -- what are they sending  
 7 as the order. What is the order that  
 8 they're saying is suspicious, correct?  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 10 Q. Well, the distributor reports a  
 11 suspicious order for customer X.  
 12 A. Of what?  
 13 Q. Of controlled substances.  
 14 A. So they're reporting the entire  
 15 order as being suspicious?  
 16 Q. Correct.  
 17 That's what they're obligated  
 18 to do, correct? Right?  
 19 A. Correct.  
 20 Q. Okay. So they report a  
 21 suspicious order to the DEA for customer X.  
 22 Customer X may have other  
 23 orders that are pending down the line.  
 24 Should the distributor cut off all orders to  
 25 customer X?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1232

1 A. Yeah, I recall the question.  
 2 Q. Vaguely?  
 3 A. Vaguely.  
 4 Q. Okay. Do you remember  
 5 answering along the lines of yes to that  
 6 question?  
 7 A. I might have. I don't  
 8 remember.  
 9 Q. Well, is that the case?  
 10 If the distributor determines  
 11 an order is suspicious and should be blocked,  
 12 the distributor needs to terminate all sales  
 13 to a customer?  
 14 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 15 hypothetical.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 17 Q. Until they can rule out that  
 18 diversion is occurring?  
 19 A. Yeah, it should hold it until  
 20 they can rule out the suspicion.  
 21 Q. Now, has DEA ever issued any  
 22 sort of guidance or pronouncement essentially  
 23 saying that you must -- as a distributor in  
 24 that circumstance, you must terminate all  
 25 future controlled substance sales to a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1234

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 2 answered. Incomplete hypothetical.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Well, first of  
 4 all, I think you started your  
 5 statement with the DEA reports it.  
 6 It's not DEA that reports the  
 7 suspicious order. It's the registrant  
 8 that --  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 10 Q. I'm sorry if I misspoke.  
 11 A. That's fine. I just want to  
 12 make sure we're clear on that.  
 13 Q. Absolutely.  
 14 A. So it's the registrant that  
 15 has -- the system that they have has deemed a  
 16 suspicious order, for a reason or reasons,  
 17 that they believe that this will -- that has  
 18 the potential to be diverted.  
 19 Q. Correct.  
 20 A. So that registrant has made the  
 21 decision -- has -- from their system they've  
 22 deemed it a suspicious order. So they should  
 23 not ship until -- if they choose to, if they  
 24 want to alleviate that suspicion. If they  
 25 choose not to, then they shouldn't ship.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1235

1 But if they choose to, then it  
 2 becomes they need to look into it further to  
 3 alleviate that suspicion.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let's --  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 6 Q. So they shouldn't ship the  
 7 order, right?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Just a  
 9 second. Let's take our final break  
 10 when you're done with this line of  
 11 questioning.  
 12 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 13 Q. So they shouldn't ship the  
 14 order, right?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 16 hypothetical.  
 17 THE WITNESS: When they deem --  
 18 when they've determined that it's  
 19 suspicious --  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 21 Q. Correct.  
 22 A. -- a suspicious order?  
 23 Correct.  
 24 Q. They shouldn't ship it?  
 25 A. Correct, they should not ship

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1237

1 orders that may not appear suspicious.  
 2 So let's say they take a while  
 3 to investigate that particular suspicious  
 4 order. They don't send it out. But in the  
 5 meantime they have in the queue other orders  
 6 from that pharmacy that do not look  
 7 suspicious to them.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete --  
 9 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 10 Q. Are they okay to ship those  
 11 orders?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 13 hypothetical.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Well, I think if  
 15 they have one in the queue that's  
 16 already saying it's suspicious, then I  
 17 would -- I would think that they would  
 18 be at least questioning it like, well,  
 19 what are they doing?  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 21 Q. Are they required to hold the  
 22 other orders that they don't deem to be  
 23 suspicious, or is it okay to exercise their  
 24 business judgment to send those orders on?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1236

1 it.  
 2 Q. Okay. But they could choose to  
 3 ship it if they wanted to. That's a business  
 4 judgment, right?  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN:  
 6 Mischaracterizes prior testimony.  
 7 THE WITNESS: They could ship  
 8 it if they -- yeah, it's a business  
 9 decision.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. So let's say they choose to not  
 12 ship it and hold the order. Are they then  
 13 required to not ship any orders to that same  
 14 customer?  
 15 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 16 hypothetical. Asked and answered.  
 17 THE WITNESS: Have they  
 18 alleviated the suspicion? Did they do  
 19 anything to alleviate the suspicion?  
 20 If they haven't alleviated the  
 21 suspicion, then it's still a  
 22 suspicious order.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 24 Q. Okay. I'm not talking about  
 25 that order; I'm talking about any additional

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1238

1 answered. Incomplete hypothetical.  
 2 And I'd appreciate the break.  
 3 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 4 repeat it?  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 6 Q. Are they required to hold the  
 7 other orders that they don't view to be  
 8 suspicious, or is it okay for the distributor  
 9 in that instance to exercise their business  
 10 judgment and send those nonsuspicious orders  
 11 out?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 13 answered. Incomplete hypothetical.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 16 Q. Yes what?  
 17 A. They can.  
 18 Q. Okay. They can ship those  
 19 other orders out?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 MS. MAINIGI: Okay. Let's go  
 22 ahead and take your break.  
 23 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off  
 24 record. The time is 4:53.  
 25 (Off the record at 4:53 p.m.)

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1239

1 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going back  
 2 on record, beginning of Media File  
 3 Number 12. The time is 5:03.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 5 Q. So, Mr. Prevoznik, just  
 6 following up on our last line of questioning,  
 7 is it fair to say that DEA has no internal  
 8 policy defining the circumstances under which  
 9 a distributor is required to terminate the  
 10 distribution of controlled substances to a  
 11 pharmacy?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.  
 13 Mischaracterizes his prior testimony.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Could you please  
 15 repeat that?  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 17 Q. Sure.  
 18 Is it fair to say that DEA has  
 19 no internal policy defining the circumstances  
 20 under which a distributor is required to  
 21 terminate the distribution of controlled  
 22 substances to a pharmacy?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. Now, do you recall being asked  
 25 last time a number of questions about the

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1241

1 Q. Okay. And the NWDA, just for  
 2 the record, is the National Wholesale  
 3 Druggists' Association?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. And that was the trade  
 6 organization for distributors at this point  
 7 in time, which is about 1993?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. Now, can you tell us your  
 10 understanding of the purpose of this document  
 11 that describes the NWDA suspicious order  
 12 monitoring system?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 14 speculation.  
 15 THE WITNESS: I think it was --  
 16 the association was assisting their  
 17 members to come up with a suspicious  
 18 order monitoring system that they  
 19 could use.  
 20 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 21 Q. And it appears that the NWDA  
 22 was working at that point in time with both  
 23 DOJ and the DEA in establishing controls  
 24 aimed at reducing diversion, fair?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1240

1 NWDA suspicious order monitoring system? And  
 2 we may have even looked at it today.  
 3 Do you remember that?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. And I believe it was  
 6 Exhibit P7. If you don't have it handy, I am  
 7 sure we can get you a new copy.  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: May the  
 9 record reflect that James is now  
 10 screwing with my exhibits, but I  
 11 appreciate it.  
 12 MS. MAINIGI: I think that's  
 13 obvious. It doesn't even need to be  
 14 reflected on the record.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 16 Q. You got one, Mr. Prevoznik?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. Okay. Perfect.  
 19 And I think it had been  
 20 previously marked P7 for the record.  
 21 Now, you testified you were --  
 22 you were familiar with this document. You  
 23 had looked at it in preparation for your  
 24 deposition?  
 25 A. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1242

1 for speculation.  
 2 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure  
 3 where I see DOJ.  
 4 I see DEA listed. I don't see  
 5 DOJ.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 7 Q. So if we take a look at page 1  
 8 of the NWDA document, Mr. Prevoznik --  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. -- second paragraph under  
 11 background, could you read that out loud?  
 12 A. "The National Wholesale  
 13 Druggists' Association voluntarily began  
 14 working with the Department of Justice, Drug  
 15 Enforcement Administration, in establishing  
 16 controls clearly aimed at reducing or  
 17 eliminating illegal product distribution."  
 18 Q. And why would the DEA have  
 19 worked with this trade organization to help  
 20 develop these controls?  
 21 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 22 Calls for speculation.  
 23 THE WITNESS: To protect the  
 24 public.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1243

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 2 Q. And the DEA at that point in  
 3 time thought it was a good thing to help a  
 4 trade organization develop guidelines because  
 5 it would help everybody, correct?  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 7 Calls for speculation.  
 8 THE WITNESS: I -- yeah, I  
 9 mean -- yeah.  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. Most of all, it would help the  
 12 public, as you said?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Now, the system -- I think you  
 15 went over this earlier. The system that they  
 16 came up with had two components to it, right?  
 17 It had the monthly after-the-fact reporting?  
 18 A. Are you on a specific page?  
 19 Q. It had the monthly  
 20 calculations, page 2.  
 21 Do you see it?  
 22 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Page 2 where?  
 23 MS. MAINIGI: Page 2 under  
 24 monthly calculations.  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Okay.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1245

1 in a specific way; is that right?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague as to  
 3 time.  
 4 THE WITNESS: That's correct.  
 5 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 6 Q. And the DEA worked with NWDA to  
 7 come up with a reporting system for the  
 8 monthly after-the-fact reports, correct?  
 9 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 10 Scope.  
 11 THE WITNESS: From my review of  
 12 the document, yes.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 14 Q. And those monthly  
 15 after-the-fact reports were sometimes called,  
 16 but not always, excessive purchase reports,  
 17 true?  
 18 A. Yes, correct.  
 19 Q. So in working with the NWDA,  
 20 the DEA essentially supported the concept of  
 21 two tiers of reporting, true?  
 22 A. The excessive purchase after  
 23 the fact and identifying the suspicious order  
 24 prior to shipping? Yes.  
 25 Q. And is it fair to say that a

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1244

1 THE WITNESS: Okay.  
 2 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 3 Q. And then it had -- so was that  
 4 the monthly after-the-fact reporting?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. Okay. And so essentially --  
 7 and then I think it's further described at  
 8 page 4.  
 9 Do you see that?  
 10 A. Where specifically on page 4?  
 11 The report --  
 12 Q. I think the top, the top part  
 13 of page 4. It kind of rolls into page 3 and  
 14 then the top part of page 4.  
 15 A. Okay.  
 16 Q. And then this also -- I think  
 17 Mr. Farrell asked you, and Ms. Singer may  
 18 have as well. On page 7, there's a part 2 to  
 19 the reporting. In addition to the  
 20 after-the-fact monthly reporting, there's a  
 21 reference to the single suspicious orders.  
 22 Do you see that?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. Now, the DEA did not require  
 25 the single suspicious orders to be reported

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1246

1 distributor that was sending in the excessive  
 2 purchase reports after the fact and was  
 3 calling or faxing in suspicious orders was in  
 4 compliance with these guidelines that DEA  
 5 worked on with the NWDEA [sic]?  
 6 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 7 Incomplete hypothetical. Scope.  
 8 THE WITNESS: So again, this  
 9 goes back to the design and the  
 10 operating. So this is the design.  
 11 So what -- what did the  
 12 registrant do to operate? I don't  
 13 know. It's --  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 15 Q. Well, in my hypothetical -- in  
 16 my hypothetical, Mr. Prevoznik, if the  
 17 registrant was submitting the excessive  
 18 purchase reports pursuant to some of the  
 19 guidelines in this document, the NWDA  
 20 document, and calling in suspicious orders,  
 21 that's the execution, right?  
 22 They were essentially in  
 23 compliance with at least these guidelines  
 24 that the NWDA put out, right?  
 25 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1247

1 hypothetical. Scope.  
 2 THE WITNESS: I don't have  
 3 enough information to make that  
 4 determination because there could  
 5 be -- it could be just what they're  
 6 reporting. There could be a whole  
 7 bunch of things they're not reporting  
 8 to us.  
 9 So it goes back to these are --  
 10 these are the orders that they did  
 11 report, and these are the orders they  
 12 did not report, which is essentially  
 13 why a lot of -- we took enforcement  
 14 actions on quite a few of these  
 15 distributors because they were not  
 16 reporting.  
 17 So it's only based on what  
 18 they're reporting to us.  
 19 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 20 Q. Operationally, however, having  
 21 a two-tier system in place that includes the  
 22 excessive purchase reports and then the  
 23 reporting separately of suspicious orders,  
 24 operationally in this time period, in the  
 25 late '90s, that was a system that certainly

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1249

1 leaving it up to the -- to the  
 2 registrant to do that, because it --  
 3 in here it's with the -- the number 9,  
 4 single suspicious order, we determined  
 5 orders to mean prior to shipment. So  
 6 it's incumbent upon that registrant.  
 7 So this is -- this is a  
 8 whole -- this is a wholesaler  
 9 association, so its members are going  
 10 to put this into -- implement it into  
 11 their system. So if they're following  
 12 what they're supposed to be doing,  
 13 then you would hope that it was  
 14 identifying the suspicious orders as  
 15 they should have.  
 16 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 17 Q. Well, let's take a look. We  
 18 remember Mr. Gitchel, right? Let's take a  
 19 look at what he wrote.  
 20 And I think we've got a couple  
 21 of letters of his attached that relate to  
 22 this system.  
 23 So if you take a look at the  
 24 very last page, page 11, Mr. Gitchel, who at  
 25 that point was -- what was his role?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1248

1 seemed to make sense to the DEA, correct?  
 2 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 3 THE WITNESS: I think it made  
 4 sense in terms of the -- at this point  
 5 we were in -- we were dealing with the  
 6 meth situation. We were -- and I  
 7 think I believe I testified to this,  
 8 that this was more -- at this point  
 9 this was more of a regional issue.  
 10 With the on -- with the  
 11 Internet and things like that where it  
 12 became a national thing, that's when  
 13 it was -- that's when orders were  
 14 clearly not being reported to us.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 16 Q. So my question was a little bit  
 17 different, right?  
 18 The structure itself for the  
 19 late -- that was in place in the late '90s,  
 20 as outlined by the NWDA suspicious order  
 21 monitoring system document, that was a system  
 22 that the DEA thought worked for that time  
 23 period, correct?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 25 THE WITNESS: I think they were

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1250

1 A. He was the IP chief over  
 2 operations, diversion operations.  
 3 Q. So he was the top dog, right,  
 4 in diversion at DEA?  
 5 A. Just over operations.  
 6 Q. And he was communicating with a  
 7 lot of people during this time period, right?  
 8 We've seen a few of his letters?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Okay. And if you take a look  
 11 at the letter which is on page 11, he writes  
 12 a letter to Ronald Streck of the National  
 13 Wholesale Druggists' Association, right?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. Okay. And did you review this  
 16 letter in preparation for your deposition  
 17 here today?  
 18 A. Yes. In the past I did, yes.  
 19 Q. Okay. So you're familiar with  
 20 this letter?  
 21 A. (Witness nods head.)  
 22 Q. Can you read -- do you see a  
 23 sentence that begins with "this system" in  
 24 the middle of the first paragraph?  
 25 A. "This system as proposed will

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1251

1 test the reporting" -- will test or meet --  
 2 "will meet the reporting requirements of 21  
 3 CFR 1301.74(b)." --  
 4 Q. So what does that mean to you?  
 5 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 6 speculation.  
 7 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what  
 8 he's saying, because the next two  
 9 sentences below that are -- he's --  
 10 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 11 Q. Well, what's he saying in this  
 12 sentence?  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Let the  
 14 witness finish his answer.  
 15 THE WITNESS: The next two  
 16 sentences after that are talking about  
 17 the after-the-fact sales, and it  
 18 doesn't relieve the registrant from  
 19 the responsibility of reporting  
 20 excessive or suspicious orders.  
 21 So -- and he clearly, again,  
 22 reiterates what I've been saying.  
 23 DEA's interpreted orders to mean prior  
 24 to shipment.  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1253

1 me again that begins with "this system."  
 2 A. "This system, as proposed, will  
 3 meet the reporting requirements of 21 CFR  
 4 1301.74."  
 5 Q. And what is 1301.74(b) of 21  
 6 CFR?  
 7 A. Suspicious orders.  
 8 Q. Okay. So Mr. Gitchel, who's  
 9 acting chief of diversion operations, is  
 10 saying in this letter that this two-component  
 11 system that we've been discussing, as  
 12 proposed, will meet the reporting  
 13 requirements of suspicious orders, correct?  
 14 A. That's what it says.  
 15 Q. And so a distributor --  
 16 MR. FINKELSTEIN: I signaled  
 17 ten minutes remaining to the witness.  
 18 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 19 Q. A distributor, Mr. Prevoznik,  
 20 who in that time period followed this system  
 21 that NWDA proposed, their system, at least,  
 22 would be in compliance with 21 CFR  
 23 1301.74(b), correct?  
 24 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Incomplete  
 25 hypothetical.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1252

1 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 2 Q. Okay. So we just went over  
 3 this system that the DEA obviously had input  
 4 into that included two components, right?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 Q. And the two components -- what  
 7 was the first component?  
 8 A. It was the after sales.  
 9 Q. Okay. So the excessive  
 10 purchase, right?  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 Q. What was the second component?  
 13 A. The -- let me check. The  
 14 suspicious orders.  
 15 Q. Right.  
 16 So those are the two components  
 17 of the NWDA system, right?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. And the sentences that he's got  
 20 after the one I asked you to read, he's  
 21 essentially saying, doing the first doesn't  
 22 relieve you of the obligation to do the  
 23 second, right?  
 24 A. Correct.  
 25 Q. Okay. So read that sentence to

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1254

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, but this  
 2 date is 1984. You've been asking me  
 3 1996 to 2006, so -- so, yeah, 1984.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 5 Q. Do you -- are you aware of any  
 6 communication by Mr. Gitchel subsequently  
 7 that overruled his statements?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 9 THE WITNESS: Not to my  
 10 knowledge.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 12 Q. Now, in this letter that  
 13 Mr. Gitchel wrote, he doesn't say anything  
 14 about halting shipment of excessive or  
 15 suspicious orders, right?  
 16 A. No.  
 17 Q. Now, the next time there is  
 18 some sort of communication with the industry  
 19 in written form, or an industry group in  
 20 written form, about approaches to suspicious  
 21 order monitoring are Mr. Rannazzisi's letters  
 22 in 2006 and 2007, right?  
 23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 24 THE WITNESS: No, we had -- we  
 25 had those conferences. I mean, I

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1255

1 think we had one from 1987, the one in  
 2 San Antonio, so we were meeting with  
 3 manufacturers and distributors.  
 4 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 5 Q. The one in 2007?  
 6 A. No. 19 -- it's in here  
 7 somewhere.  
 8 Q. Well, just listen to my  
 9 question, though.  
 10 A. Sure.  
 11 Q. So Mr. Gitchel was  
 12 communicating with a trade group, right?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. The National Wholesale  
 15 Druggists' Association, right?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. And that was a trade group that  
 18 communicated then with its distributors, its  
 19 member distributors, right?  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 21 speculation.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 23 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 24 Q. And distributor conferences or  
 25 conferences that DEA has, those are

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1257

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Foundation.  
 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 3 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 4 Q. And obviously we had  
 5 conversations previously about the statements  
 6 in those letters, right?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. Now, prior to Mr. Rannazzisi's  
 9 letters, you all, the DEA, began the  
 10 distributor initiative, right?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 12 answered.  
 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 15 Q. And I think you mentioned that  
 16 some of the earlier distributor initiatives  
 17 took place in the fall of 2005; is that  
 18 right?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 20 answered.  
 21 THE WITNESS: I actually think  
 22 it was August. Some of the documents  
 23 today were August.  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 25 Q. Okay. Do you want to find your

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1256

1 definitely important, but there's no  
 2 guarantee that you're going to reach every  
 3 single distributor out there, right?  
 4 A. No, but I thought you were  
 5 asking what guidance DEA has given.  
 6 Q. No.  
 7 A. Okay.  
 8 Q. The question that I asked you  
 9 was: So Mr. Gitchel wrote a communication to  
 10 the NWDA which theoretically could have been  
 11 shared with its member distributors, right?  
 12 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 13 speculation.  
 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 15 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 16 Q. And it gave them some guidance  
 17 about their suspicious order monitoring  
 18 system, correct?  
 19 A. Correct.  
 20 Q. And next time the DEA issued  
 21 any sort of guidance, or anything that could  
 22 be called guidance, in a written form out to  
 23 all distributors about their suspicious order  
 24 monitoring systems was in the form of  
 25 Mr. Rannazzisi's letters in 2006, 2007?

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1258

1 document? Let's find the Cardinal one.  
 2 There's a meeting with  
 3 Cardinal, and you're right, it's August. At  
 4 least the date of this memo is August 23,  
 5 2005.  
 6 A. August 23rd, got it. P23.  
 7 Q. Perfect. Thank you.  
 8 Now, you did not attend this  
 9 meeting with Cardinal Health, right?  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Asked and  
 11 answered.  
 12 THE WITNESS: No.  
 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 14 Q. Mr. Mapes and Ms. Seeger  
 15 attended the meeting?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. And all DEA has at this point  
 18 in time reflective of what got said or not  
 19 said at this meeting is this memo and the  
 20 attached PowerPoint, true?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. What points were emphasized at  
 23 this meeting in 2005 versus any meeting that  
 24 took place in 2009, 2010, you're not in a  
 25 position to say beyond the documents you have

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1259

1 in front of you, correct?  
 2 A. Correct.  
 3 Q. Now, look at the last paragraph  
 4 of this memo. Do you see that Cardinal was  
 5 requesting that DEA provide them with certain  
 6 information?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. Do you know if the DEA ever  
 9 provided Cardinal with that information it  
 10 was seeking?  
 11 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 12 THE WITNESS: I don't know.  
 13 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vague.  
 14 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 15 Q. Now, do you recall the industry  
 16 group that represented distributors at some  
 17 point morphed its name into HDMA, correct?  
 18 A. Correct.  
 19 Q. So it went from NWDA to HDMA,  
 20 right?  
 21 A. Yeah. I don't know if there  
 22 was one in between, but, yes.  
 23 Q. And now I think they're HDA.  
 24 Does that sound right to you?  
 25 A. Yeah.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1261

1 A. Can you repeat it?  
 2 Q. Sure.  
 3 Do you recall from the time  
 4 period of about 2007 to 2013, DEA did not  
 5 want to sit down with HDMA to provide them  
 6 with guidance or guidelines related to an  
 7 adequate suspicious order monitoring system?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. "Yes" meaning they did not want  
 10 to sit down with HDMA?  
 11 A. Right.  
 12 Q. Whereas in the late '90s, we  
 13 saw that they were willing to sit down with  
 14 HDMA, right?  
 15 A. Correct.  
 16 Q. And sitting down with HDMA or  
 17 its predecessor organization in the late '90s  
 18 helped the public, right?  
 19 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Calls for  
 20 speculation.  
 21 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 22 Q. Isn't that what you told me, it  
 23 helped the public?  
 24 A. What, by meeting with them?  
 25 Q. Yes.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1260

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1262

1 Q. I don't know why they keep  
 2 changing their names.  
 3 But do you recall that that was  
 4 a group that continued to want to meet with  
 5 DEA to continue to give guidance on how to  
 6 update their suspicious order monitoring  
 7 systems?  
 8 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope. Calls  
 9 for speculation.  
 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.  
 11 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 12 Q. Do you recall though that  
 13 within DEA there was an evolution of thought  
 14 related to dealing with groups like HDMA  
 15 where, let's say, from 2007 through to 2013  
 16 DEA did not want to sit down and provide  
 17 specific guidance or guidelines to the HDMAs  
 18 of the world as to how to put their  
 19 suspicious order monitoring systems together?  
 20 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.  
 21 Foundation.  
 22 THE WITNESS: Is that a  
 23 question?  
 24 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 25 Q. Yes.

1 A. Yes. Well, we hoped that it  
 2 helped the public, yes. But, again, it's the  
 3 registrants that have to design the system  
 4 and operate the system. It's not NWDA, and  
 5 it's not HDA, and it's not HDMA. It's the  
 6 registrant, which is why we shifted to that.  
 7 Q. Okay. You didn't want to sit  
 8 down with HDMA to help the public?  
 9 A. No.  
 10 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Wait. Vague.  
 11 Argumentative. Mischaracterizes prior  
 12 testimony.  
 13 THE WITNESS: No, we sat  
 14 with -- we did the distributor  
 15 initiative because of what we saw, and  
 16 we saw that the registrants needed to  
 17 be -- have -- to sit down with the  
 18 registrants, talk to them and go over  
 19 their own data with them to show the  
 20 anomalies that are going on, in the  
 21 hope that they would stop what they  
 22 were doing.  
 23 They said they were going to  
 24 fix it; they didn't fix it. So we  
 25 weren't going to go to a trade

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1263

1 association if the registrant isn't  
 2 going to fix their own internal system  
 3 that they have.  
 4 MR. FINKELSTEIN: One minute,  
 5 Ms. Mainigi.  
 6 QUESTIONS BY MS. MAINIGI:  
 7 Q. With respect to -- you made  
 8 some reference, and I think you're doing it  
 9 again, to some failures in the industry. Do  
 10 you remember that? Failures by the industry  
 11 to comply.  
 12 Do you remember having those  
 13 discussions with Ms. Singer earlier today?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. Okay. And by "failures in the  
 16 industry," I assume you're referring to the  
 17 various legal actions that distributors had  
 18 with Cardinal, true? Or excuse me, the  
 19 various legal actions that distributors had  
 20 with DEA, true?  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. And so various distributors at  
 23 various points in time entered into legal  
 24 settlements with the DEA, true?  
 25 A. True.

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1265

1 CERTIFICATE  
 2  
 3 I, CARRIE A. CAMPBELL, Registered Diplomate Reporter,  
 4 Certified Realtime Reporter and Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify  
 5 that prior to the commencement  
 6 of the examination, Thomas Prevoznik was duly sworn by me  
 7 to testify to the truth, the  
 8 whole truth and nothing but the truth.  
 9 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing is a verbatim  
 10 transcript of the  
 11 testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the  
 12 time, place and on the date  
 13 hereinbefore set forth, to the best of my ability.  
 14 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am  
 15 neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of  
 16 any of the parties to this  
 17 action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such  
 18 attorney or counsel, and  
 19 that I am not financially interested in the action.  
 20  
 21  
 22

16  
 17 CARRIE A. CAMPBELL, NCRA Registered Diplomate  
 18 Reporter  
 19 Certified Realtime Reporter Notary Public  
 20 Dated: May 21, 2019  
 21  
 22

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1264

1 MR. FINKELSTEIN: We're at  
 2 2:30, Special Master. I'd ask to go  
 3 off the record.  
 4 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: I think  
 5 we're done.  
 6 MS. MAINIGI: Thank you very  
 7 much, Mr. Prevoznik.  
 8 VIDEOGRAPHER: All right. This  
 9 concludes today's deposition. The  
 10 time is 5:30.  
 11 (Deposition concluded at 5:30 p.m.)  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1266

1 INSTRUCTIONS TO WITNESS  
 2  
 3 Please read your deposition over  
 4 carefully and make any necessary corrections.  
 5 You should state the reason in the  
 6 appropriate space on the errata sheet for any  
 7 corrections that are made.  
 8 After doing so, please sign the  
 9 errata sheet and date it. You are signing  
 10 same subject to the changes you have noted on  
 11 the errata sheet, which will be attached to  
 12 your deposition.  
 13 It is imperative that you return  
 14 the original errata sheet to the deposing  
 15 attorney within thirty (30) days of receipt  
 16 of the deposition transcript by you. If you  
 17 fail to do so, the deposition transcript may  
 18 be deemed to be accurate and may be used in  
 19 court.  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1267

1 ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT

2

3

4 I, \_\_\_\_\_, do hereby certify that I have  
5 read the foregoing  
6 pages and that the same is a correct transcription of the  
7 answers given by me to  
8 the questions therein propounded, except for the corrections  
9 or changes in form or  
10 substance, if any, noted in the attached Errata Sheet.

11

12

13 Prevoznik, Volume III DATE

14 Thomas

15

16 Subscribed and sworn to before me this

17 day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20 \_\_\_\_\_.  
18 My commission expires: \_\_\_\_\_

19 Notary Public

20

21

22

23

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1269

1 LAWYER'S NOTES

2

3 PAGE LINE

4 \_\_\_\_\_

5 \_\_\_\_\_

6 \_\_\_\_\_

7 \_\_\_\_\_

8 \_\_\_\_\_

9 \_\_\_\_\_

10 \_\_\_\_\_

11 \_\_\_\_\_

12 \_\_\_\_\_

13 \_\_\_\_\_

14 \_\_\_\_\_

15 \_\_\_\_\_

16 \_\_\_\_\_

17 \_\_\_\_\_

18 \_\_\_\_\_

19 \_\_\_\_\_

20 \_\_\_\_\_

21 \_\_\_\_\_

22 \_\_\_\_\_

23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 \_\_\_\_\_

25 \_\_\_\_\_

05-17-2019

Prevoznik, Thomas

Page 1268

1 ERRATA

2

3 PAGE LINE CHANGE/REASON

4 \_\_\_\_\_

5 \_\_\_\_\_

6 \_\_\_\_\_

7 \_\_\_\_\_

8 \_\_\_\_\_

9 \_\_\_\_\_

10 \_\_\_\_\_

11 \_\_\_\_\_

12 \_\_\_\_\_

13 \_\_\_\_\_

14 \_\_\_\_\_

15 \_\_\_\_\_

16 \_\_\_\_\_

17 \_\_\_\_\_

18 \_\_\_\_\_

19 \_\_\_\_\_

20 \_\_\_\_\_

21 \_\_\_\_\_

22 \_\_\_\_\_

23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 \_\_\_\_\_

25 \_\_\_\_\_